



HARVARD COLLEGE  
LIBRARY



GIFT OF THE  
GOVERNMENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES









INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE  
ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 2

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

---

JUNE 5, 1956

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INDEX IN PART 4 OF THIS SERIES)



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
DEPOSITED BY THE  
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

OCT 5 1956

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

### UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

RICHARD ARENS, *Director*

# CONTENTS

---

## Executive Hearings (See Part 3)<sup>1</sup>

	Page
June 2, 1956: Testimony of—	
Joseph John Schoemehl.....	4949
Loyal Hammack.....	4966
George V. L. Hardy.....	4971
June 4, 1956: Testimony of—	
Joseph John Schoemehl (resumed).....	4979
Obadiah Jones.....	4981

## Public Hearings

### PART 1

	Page
June 4, 1956: Testimony of—	
William W. Cortor.....	4724
Afternoon session:	
William W. Cortor (resumed).....	4758
James H. Sage.....	4761
Elliott Waxman.....	4784
Leslie S. Davison.....	4793
Sol S. Nissen.....	4794
John William Simpson.....	4798

### PART 2

June 5, 1956: Testimony of—	
John William Simpson (resumed).....	4803
William Henry Holland.....	4808
Harvey John Day.....	4818
Thelma Hecht (Mrs. Julius Hecht).....	4825
Brockman Schumacher.....	4829
Thomas A. Younglove.....	4834
Afternoon session:	
Thomas A. Younglove (resumed).....	4845
Orville Leach.....	4864
Zollie C. Carpenter.....	4869
James Payne.....	4876
Helen Aukamp Sage (Mrs. James H. Sage).....	4883

### PART 3

June 6, 1956: Testimony of—	
Dr. Sol Londe.....	4889
William Edwin Davis.....	4895
Ida Holland (Mrs. William Henry Holland).....	4899
Edwin Leslie Richardson.....	4902
Anne (Ann) Yasgur Kling.....	4912
Afternoon session:	
Anne (Ann) Yasgur Kling (resumed).....	4920
Gilbert Harold Hall.....	4940
Richard L. Stanford.....	4944
Romey Hudson.....	4945

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee August 24, 1956, and ordered to be printed.

## PART 4

## June 8, 1956: Testimony of—

Helen Musiel.....	4993
Hershel James Walker.....	5000
George Kimmel.....	5004
Hershel James Walker (recalled).....	5014
Linus E. Wampler.....	5017
George Kimmel (recalled).....	5026
Afternoon session:	
Dr. John F. Rutledge.....	5028
Ella Mae Posey Pappademos.....	5051
Clara Perkins (Mrs. Haven Perkins).....	5058
Haven Perkins.....	5065
Julius Hecht.....	5069
Sol Derman.....	5070
Douglas MacLeod.....	5072
Index.....	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, \* \* \**

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*  
17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

- \* \* \* \* \*
- (q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.  
(A) Un-American Activities.  
(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE X

### STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress:

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE XI

### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 2

---

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*St. Louis, Mo.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee met at 9:15 a. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 3, the United States Court and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder, James B. Frazier, Jr., and Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams, and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

(Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and Gordon H. Scherer were present at the time of convening.)

MR. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Very well, let's proceed.

Call the next witness.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. John Simpson, will you return to the witness stand, please.

MR. MOULDER. Would you be seated, Mr. Simpson.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

## TESTIMONY OF JOHN W. SIMPSON—Resumed

MR. MOULDER. Mr. Simpson, yesterday afternoon you were provided an opportunity by this committee to seek counsel to represent you, as the committee advised you to do. Have you procured counsel?

MR. SIMPSON. The hours of the Bar Association of St. Louis are—Monday and Friday they are 10 to 12, and Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday they are 2 to 4. However, I went to the trouble to call up last night, or this morning, in case the janitor or somebody else was in. Nobody was in.

MR. MOULDER. No one was there.

Did you call or speak or confer with any other attorney?

MR. SIMPSON. I don't have the money to pay lawyers.

MR. MOULDER. Are you employed now anywhere?

MR. SIMPSON. Yes.

MR. MOULDER. You do have an income?

MR. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you attempted to confer with any attorney to see whether or not they would charge you, or what they would charge you to represent you as counsel?

Mr. SIMPSON. It is well known what lawyers charge. I don't have the money to pay lawyers.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you have made no attempt to procure an attorney?

Mr. SIMPSON. I made an attempt. I called them twice.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to have counsel to represent you?

Mr. SIMPSON. I don't particularly care.

Mr. SCHERER. I take the same position that I did last night.

It is obvious from this man's statement now and last night that he doesn't want counsel.

Under the Constitution a man has the right either in court or before a hearing and a committee such as this to represent himself. You can't force counsel upon a man. He has a constitutional right to represent himself. This man evidently doesn't want the advice of counsel.

Mr. MOULDER. And the committee has no authority or funds, of course, to provide counsel for him.

Mr. SCHERER. When were you subpoenaed?

Mr. SIMPSON. I don't know. I don't have it with me.

Mr. SCHERER. Counsel, when was the witness subpoenaed?

Mr. SIMPSON. 16th of April, it says.

Mr. SCHERER. I will repeat, Witness, the question I asked you last night.

Do you read the newspapers?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am going to do the same thing I did yesterday. I am going to plead the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you in the room yesterday morning when the chairman of this committee made his opening statement?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I had to be.

Mr. SCHERER. You were here.

Did you hear what he said with reference to the St. Louis Bar Association furnishing counsel for witnesses who were unable to obtain counsel?

Mr. SIMPSON. Nothing is wrong with my hearing.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear that?

Mr. SIMPSON. Oh, yes, I heard that.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you read in the paper prior to your coming here yesterday morning that the bar association of—

Would you look this way, sir, when I am talking to you?

Let the record show that the witness is not even paying attention to this member of the committee while he is talking to him.

I am asking you this question:

Did you see in the papers prior to coming here yesterday morning—or did you have knowledge of the fact that the St. Louis Bar Association was furnishing counsel for any witness called before this committee that did not have the funds to secure counsel or was unable to obtain counsel for any other reason?

Mr. SIMPSON. There is something I don't understand.

Am I under oath?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; you are under oath. You were sworn yesterday.

Mr. SIMPSON. I didn't know whether it continued.

Well, will you repeat the question?

Mr. SCHERER. Would it make any difference whether you were under oath or not, whether you told the truth? Would that make any difference, Son?

Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment and possible self-incrimination.

Mr. SCHERER. I will repeat my original question.

Did you know prior to coming into this courtroom yesterday that the St. Louis Bar Association was furnishing counsel for witnesses who were unable to obtain counsel for one reason or for another?

Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment and possible self-incrimination.

Mr. SCHERER. It is obvious then that we should proceed.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Simpson, were you subpoenaed by a deputy United States marshal on May 10 to appear as a witness in this hearing?

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. May I correct my question by stating: "You were subpoenaed on May 9?"

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, I think I can say that there's two dates on here. There's June 4, 1956, and April 16, 1956.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take out of your pocket the subpoena that was served on you?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I see it, please?

(Document handed to Mr. Tavenner.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This subpoena bears date the 16th of April, 1956. It was served on you, was it not, on the 9th of May? Do you recall?

Mr. SIMPSON. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, hand it back to him.

Mr. MOULDER. Who served the subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. A deputy United States marshal.

Mr. Simpson, you were employed, were you not, at the time that service was made on you at the Chevrolet plant of General Motors?

Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment and possible self-incrimination.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. SCHERER. You keep in mind what I said to you yesterday, that this committee does not accept your declination to answer. We feel that you are not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith in refusing to answer as to where you were employed, what your date of birth was, and your residence.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee desires to inquire of you what knowledge you have regarding an organized group of the Communist Party in the automotive business in St. Louis. So I will ask you the question, if you will tell us, please, whether or not there was such an organized group of the Communist Party established within the automotive industry.

Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Did I understand you to say you decline to answer?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer because of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there such?

Mr. MOULDER. In connection with that, the purpose of directing you to answer is to warn you, not in the spirit of a threat, of the dangers in which you might be involved in connection with contempt proceedings, and for your own benefit we direct you to answer in order to give you an opportunity to avoid possible contempt proceedings.

Do you still wish to—

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities within the automotive industry at the present time?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you presently a member of any organized group of the Communist Party within the automotive industry?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. FRAZIER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is all.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer, any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

I ask you this: Yesterday you were asked where you lived at the present time. I am going to repeat that question, keeping in mind the warnings that were given you yesterday.

Where do you now live?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. And where were you born?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. SCHERER. How old are you?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer, and further advised of the danger in which he places himself in connection with

contempt proceedings for arrogantly and without due cause refusing to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you tell us something of your educational background.

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct him to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. How long have you lived in the city of St. Louis?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever go to school?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Do you still decline to answer?

Mr. SIMPSON. What is the question?

Mr. MOULDER. We direct you to answer that question.

Mr. SIMPSON. Which question?

Mr. MOULDER. Which Mr. Scherer propounded to you. He asked if you ever went to school.

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Where have you been employed since 1950?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you married?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SIMPSON. I still decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. What is your full name?

Mr. SIMPSON. John William Simpson.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the conduct of this witness——

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the conduct of this witness and the fact that he is in obvious contempt of the Congress of the United States, I now move that this committee recommend to the full committee when it meets in executive session that John William Simpson be cited for contempt.

Mr. MOULDER. It has been duly moved by Mr. Scherer, of Ohio, that the witness John Simpson be cited for contempt, and that this subcommittee so recommend to the full committee to take such action.

Mr. FRAZIER. Second.

Mr. MOULDER. And the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Frazier, seconds the motion made by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Scherer.

Therefore, the chair now will call the roll of the vote of the subcommittee on the motion.

Members of the committee who are in favor of the motion made by Mr. Scherer will answer "Aye," and those opposed will answer "No."

Mr. Scherer of Ohio?

Mr. SCHERER. Vote "aye."

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier, of Tennessee?

Mr. FRAZIER. Aye.

Mr. MOULDER. The chairman, Morgan Moulder, also votes "aye."

Therefore, the committee, having unanimously voted that the witness John Simpson be cited for contempt; the subcommittee will so recommend to the full committee to take such action.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William Henry Holland.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM HENRY HOLLAND

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. HOLLAND. William Henry Holland.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Holland, it is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. It is the practice of the committee to advise each witness that he has the right to have counsel with him or to consult counsel at any time during his questioning if he so desires.

When and where were you born, Mr. Holland?

Mr. HOLLAND. Galena, Kans., December 4, 1925.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where he now resides.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

The purpose of our directing you to answer the question that counsel has propounded to you is to advise you that in refusing to answer without good cause or in good faith you may be placed in a position whereby it will be necessary for the subcommittee to recommend that you be cited for contempt. And a direction is not in the spirit of threatening you or coercing you, but for your own benefit.

Therefore, you are directed to answer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe I must stand by my former answer.

Mr. MOULDER. You mean you reassert your——

Mr. HOLLAND. I reassert the privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. Your former response. You didn't answer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I reassert the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, if you know how many organized groups of the Communist Party there are at Fisher Body plant in St. Louis?

Mr. HOLLAND. I reassert the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you employed at the Fisher Body plant?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been employed there?

Mr. HOLLAND. Is an estimate good?

Approximately 3½ years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately 3½ years.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, the first question was where the witness resided.

Did you state your name for the record?

Mr. HOLLAND. I did state my name for the record. I am not certain.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you please state your name for the record?

Mr. HOLLAND. William Henry Holland.

Mr. MOULDER. And you declined to answer the question as to where you reside?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt.

Do you honestly feel that to answer the question as to where you now live might tend to incriminate you? Do you honestly believe that?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will be forced to reassert the privilege to the question.

Mr. SCHERER. I think the courts have said that he must answer that question, and I ask you direct the witness.

That is the basis for his being permitted to refuse to answer the question, on the grounds of the fifth amendment, namely that he honestly feels in good faith that to answer the question might tend to incriminate him.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the answer might be used in prosecution against me.

Mr. SCHERER. You do.

That is a proper answer then, a proper response.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Holland, were you at any time a leader of a group of the Communist Party while employed at Fisher Body plant?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were so identified by a witness who testified here yesterday morning—Mr. Cortor. In fact, Mr. Cortor testified that you were the leader of a group, and that he was in your group.

Was there any part of that testimony, insofar as it related to you, false?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Holland, please speak up. We cannot hear you.

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Holland, your name appears in a notebook of Mr. James Sage which was in his possession on June 18, 1951, indicating that you were the leader of a group which evidently intended to go to Chicago for some convention.

Did you go to Chicago in 1951 to a convention?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Sage solicit your attendance at the convention in Chicago on June 29 and 30 sponsored by the American Peace Crusade?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, to what extent the Communist Party was instrumental in arranging for the transportation of people from St. Louis to Chicago in June of 1951?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a statement which will explain certain factors about my education and employment, which I would like to submit. I asked to submit it earlier.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to file the statement with the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. All right.

The statement now being presented by the witness will be duly filed and marked "Holland Exhibit No. 1," for identification purposes only.

(The statement referred to was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please, sir?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a bachelor's degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. From what place?

Mr. HOLLAND. Washington University.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry but I can't hear the witness. He had some kind of degree, but I didn't hear what he said.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a bachelor's degree from Washington University.

Mr. SCHERER. Can't you talk just a little louder?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a bachelor's degree from Washington University.

Mr. SCHERER. Bachelor's degree in what?

Mr. HOLLAND. In physics.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your degree?

Mr. HOLLAND. In 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. In June 1950?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could have been: I could have been in the January class. The degrees, I believe, are conferred in June. And I was—I would have been in the January class, but the degree was not conferred until June—that is, whatever you want to call it.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry. Maybe my hearing is bad, but I can't hear this witness.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was asked whether it was January or June of 1950, and I pointed out that I am uncertain of the date because the commencement was in June, and, whereas I had earned the degree in January —

Mr. TAVENNER. After completion of your work in school for the degree what was your first employment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The first job I was able to obtain was in a trailer-renting establishment.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then what was your next job? With the Fisher Body plant?

Mr. HOLLAND. No, it was not.

My next job was American Manganese Steel, as a chemist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was that? In St. Louis?

Mr. HOLLAND. Wellston. It is a suburb.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your next employment with Fisher Body?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. My next employment was with General Steel Casting.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period of your employment there?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was 1 year; the last part of 1951 to September of 1952. I could be a month off.

Mr. TAVENNER. What employment followed that?

Mr. HOLLAND. I then went to Fisher Body.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you became employed at Fisher Body at what date?

Mr. HOLLAND. September 17, 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time that you became employed by Fisher Body?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to answer that question on the previous grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a copy of your application for employment at the Fisher Body plant. It is purportedly signed by you, William Henry Holland. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not it is the application submitted by you.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question on the previous grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is your refusal to answer that question based on the fact that you concealed the information requested on this application as to your college training?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question on the previous grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did actually conceal that information from your employer, did you not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to introduce into evidence the application for employment by William Henry Holland, with the Fisher Body plant, ask that it be marked "Holland Exhibit No. 2" for identification and retained in the files of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The application referred to will be marked "Holland Exhibit No. 2," and will be admitted as requested by counsel.

(The document referred to was marked "Holland Exhibit No. 2" and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt again to ask this witness a question?

You submitted a statement to this committee, which I have.

Were the statements in this memorandum that you submitted to the committee true?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. You understand you are under oath?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. SCHERER. And you say that all of the statements contained in this memorandum that you submitted to the committee are true?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are true to the best of my knowledge, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. And you want the committee to consider these statements and make them part of the records of the committee. Is that right?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. All right then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer Mr. Tavenner's question with reference to the application that he filed for employment, because in the statement that he submitted to the committee he explains why, or attempts to explain why, he is working as a semiskilled worker in a factory. And if he has done that, since he has done that—and he has certainly done it voluntarily—since he has done that he has certainly waived any privilege that he might have in this instance to invoke the fifth amendment.

In the statement, among other things, he says:

I am now working as a semiskilled worker in a factory; this in spite of the fact that I have an A. B. degree in physics.

And then he goes on in this statement to discuss, in full, his employment and why he is so employed and why he accepted a job.

When he submits that to the committee—and did so under oath—and wants it to be considered as a part of the record, we certainly have the right to ask him concerning that statement, to cross-examine him. And when we do ask him questions with reference to material that he has submitted in this statement he certainly does not have the right now to invoke the fifth amendment and refuse to answer those questions.

Will you, Mr. Tavenner, repeat then your question so the record may be absolutely clear. Repeat your question with reference to his application for employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Holland, did you conceal from your employer the information requested in the form of application, as to whether or not you had had college training?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. In view of what I have said, in view of what has transpired, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have stated that I work at Fisher Body. I believe that is the point at issue, is it not?

Mr. SCHERER. The point at issue is the question asked you by Mr. Tavenner; why you didn't disclose on your application for employment the fact that you had a degree in chemistry from Washington University. That is the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the real point at issue in this case. That is the thing we are investigating.

Now I feel that if you do not answer that question, in view of what I have said you placed yourself in contempt of this committee. And, with that explanation, I think you should answer at the direction of the chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. MOULDER. May I make this comment:

It has been my observation and my understanding, too, from hearings had before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that there is an acute shortage of engineers, chemists, physicists throughout the country, and great need for their services. But, in spite of the fact that you were so specially trained, you chose to work on the assembly line. That is something that we are trying to find out, why you do that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe I explained that in my statement, that I was financially unable to work in that field with what jobs I could find.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you approached by any functionary of the Communist Party to take part in the colonization plan of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Namely, to get into industry.

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised by any functionary of the Communist Party to conceal the fact that you had a degree in physics in order to help you get in as a laborer in an industrial plant for the purpose of taking leadership in the Communist Party within that plant?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a fact that that is the reason that you sought employment in the Fisher Body plant as a laborer when you were highly trained?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not sure what that question means.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I haven't made it plain will you strike the question.

Is it a fact that you sought employment in the Fisher Body plant in a type of work that required ordinary labor when you were trained as a physicist in order that you might become a leader in the field of labor and in the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question—

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask again that you direct this witness to answer the question for the simple reason that in the statement that he submitted to this committee, which he said is true, under oath, he gives an explanation as to why he sought employment in a plant as a laborer.

Therefore, we certainly, as I said before, have the right to cross-examine him on the basis of the statement he submitted. And he certainly is not entitled to invoke the fifth amendment.

I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would you state the question?

In your speech on communism I am afraid I missed the essential point of the question. Is it why I went to work at Fisher Body?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Did you seek employment at Fisher Body in a position as a laborer—

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not working as a laborer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the exact position that you took when you first went with Fisher Body?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am a semi-skilled worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of that work?

Mr. HOLLAND. Door hanging. I hang doors.

Mr. TAVENNER. You hang doors on the assembly line?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; it is a semi-skilled job.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you accept a position or seek a position at the Fisher Body plant on the assembly line although you were trained as a physicist in order that you might take leadership in the field of labor and the Communist Party?

You understand the question now; do you not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe so.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

You do understand the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated my reason in the pamphlet for taking the job.

I took the job for economic reasons.

This is the content of your question. That was the reason I took the job.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer the question now propounded by Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would constitute a "No" answer to his question; would it not?

Mr. MOULDER. Do you now decline to answer his question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am saying that my statement, I believe, constitutes an answer of "No" to his question.

Mr. SCHERER. Then I think the witness should answer.

Not what he thinks his——

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your answer is that you did not take that position with a view of becoming active in the field of labor and the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then why did you conceal the fact that you were college-trained?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't want to be repetitious, but it is for the reasons that I have already stated, that he has opened up the door.

We certainly have the right to ask him, cross-examine him with reference to this statement that he submitted to the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you told to conceal that fact by members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you actually intend, when you became so employed, to cooperate with the Communist Party in its plan of colonization in industry?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. I think there should be a direction to answer that question.

I am again reading his statement, and certainly, in light of his statement, we have a right to ask him that question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question; same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did, very shortly after becoming employed by Fisher Body, become the leader of a group of the Communist Party consisting solely of employees of Fisher Body, did you not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are the leader of such a group now; are you not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. While in Washington University did you become acquainted with James H. Sage?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was James Sage also employed at Fisher Body at any time while you were there?

Mr. HOLLAND. I don't believe I can answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. The record of his employment was introduced in evidence showing that he was reemployed on August 13, 1952. I am not certain how long his employment continued or as to whether he is still employed there. My recollection is he is not employed there now.

Did you know of his employment while you were so employed?

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not know of his employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not know?

The testimony also is that he obtained employment in 1950. Were you aware of the circumstances under which he sought employment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was part of the colonization plan in industry of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with him at Washington University?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party group while in attendance at Washington University?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time or times that I have not specifically inquired about?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier, any questions?

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you know James H. Sage when you were attending the University of Washington?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. FRAZIER. You graduated in the same class with him from the business school; didn't you?

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not take part in the commencement.

Mr. FRAZIER. I didn't ask you whether you took part in the commencement. I asked you if you graduated in the same class with James H. Sage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will be forced to refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. FRAZIER. At the same time you got your bachelor's degree in business he got a master's degree in business from Washington University; didn't he?

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg your pardon. I didn't receive a degree in business.

Mr. FRAZIER. All right, you got your bachelor's degree in what?

Mr. HOLLAND. Physics.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Were you in the hearing room yesterday when William Cortor testified?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear his testimony?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear his testimony in reference to you?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear him say that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, I guess so.

Mr. SCHERER. Did William Cortor tell the truth?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. In this statement which you submitted to the committee you say, in part:

This search soon led me to an article in one of our local papers describing one witness who was to be called whom they described as a "colonizer." Here I found the ambiguous circumstances around which an imaginative and unprincipled professional stool pigeon might spin a web of lies for my entrapment.

Were you referring to Cortor as a stool pigeon?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe he works as a stool pigeon; does he not?

Mr. SCHERER. Were you referring to him as a stool pigeon?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. What is a stool pigeon?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe a stool pigeon is a person who, for some reason, seeks to entrap others for criminal prosecution.

Mr. SCHERER. He was working for the Government of the United States.

Now, irrespective of what you think about Cortor, you have called him a stool pigeon and indicated that he spun a web of lies.

Now you have the opportunity here, young man, to say under oath what this man, whom you have called a stool pigeon and say spun a web of lies, lied about you when he told about your activities in the Communist Party. And this is your opportunity.

Did this man, whom you brand as a stool pigeon, an unprincipled individual, a spinner of lies, lie before this committee under oath?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will be forced to refuse to answer that question on the grounds—

Mr. SCHERER. You are not forced to answer that. We are asking you now.

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Whom do you expect us to believe then? This man who came here under oath and testified freely and openly, or you here, a man who calls him a stool pigeon and who slanders him? And then you are unwilling to say to this committee that he did lie about you. Why?

Mr. MOULDER. I have a question to ask you.

Have you ever read this pamphlet, this alleged paper entitled "The St. Louis Defender," issued by the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Just one more question.

Do you know the witness Elliott Waxman who testified here yesterday?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. You heard him testify; did you not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I heard his testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you prepare his statement that he submitted to the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will have to refuse to answer that; fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I do not think Waxman, with his lack of educational background, could prepare the memorandum that he submitted to this committee. But the language in his memorandum is strikingly similar to that which is in yours, your memorandum that you submitted to the committee. It uses some of the same phrases, some of the same language, some of the same words.

Do you want to tell us whether you helped prepare his memorandum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. The language that appears in a couple of paragraphs of this bulletin, issued on May 26, 1956, entitled "The St. Louis Defender," is strikingly similar to the language that you used in your memorandum.

Did you have anything to do with the preparation of this pamphlet?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will refuse to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. It was reported to us that prior to the beginning of the hearings that there was a meeting in some hotel, the name of which I don't remember, by persons who had been subpoenaed by this committee, and possibly other persons, who held a conference in this meeting and discussed their conduct and decisions as to how they would testify or refuse to testify before this committee.

Did you attend or participate in such a meeting?

Mr. HOLLAND. Could you tell me the date of that meeting?

Mr. SCHERER. Irrespective of—

Mr. MOULDER. It has been during the past month.

Have you ever attended any such meeting regardless of the date?

Mr. HOLLAND. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Why did you want to know the date if you were going to refuse to answer the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was a different question I refused to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused, and may claim his attendance fees with the clerk of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John Day.

Will you come forward; please, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. DAY. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF HARVEY JOHN DAY, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL; DOUGLAS MacLEOD

(The witness confers with his counsel)

Mr. MACLEOD. My name is Douglas MacLeod, attorney-at-law, 722 Chestnut Street. I represent Mr. Day. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Day is an unwilling witness. He will give the committee no information that could be helpful to this committee along the lines that have been asked about.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt?

Mr. MACLEOD. I insist that the taxpayers' money not be wasted, my time, and the committee's time, and Mr. Day's time, and that he not be harassed.

Any questions could obviously be only for the purpose——

Mr. MOULDER. Under the rules of the committee, you can represent your client and advise him. But if you don't conduct yourself properly under the rules of the committee you can be ejected from the hearing room unless you desist.

Proceed with the examination of the witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds——on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You refuse to state your name?

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. My name is Harvey John Day, and I live at——

Mr. MACLEOD. Wait until they ask you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let the record show that counsel for the witness has already identified himself as Douglas MacLeod.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't get the name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Douglas MacLeod.

When and where were you born, Mr. Day?

Mr. DAY. I was born at Washburn, Mo., about 3½ miles out of Washburn, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now live in St. Louis?

Mr. DAY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mr. DAY. In Robertson is my address, Robertson, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How far is that from St. Louis?

Mr. DAY. It is about 18 miles, I judge; 18, 20 miles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived at that place or in the vicinity of St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. About 3 years, I would judge.

Wait a minute, wait a minute. About a year and a half or some such matter as that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a document marked for identification purposes only as "Day Exhibit No. 1." It is a photostatic copy of the September 28, 1938, issue of the Daily Record of Chicago, Ill., and refer you to an article entitled "Name CP Head."

Will you examine it, please?

(Document handed to counsel for the witness.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I will refuse to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine it, please? That was my question.

Mr. DAY. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Let the record show that counsel received the document referred to by Mr. Tavenner, and refused to give the witness an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. MACLEOD. Let the record show the document is on the table in front of the witness, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is now.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to examine the document in order that you might be asked a question concerning the document.

Mr. SCHERER. Before we proceed any further, while he is examining it, I think if counsel in this case does not know the rules of this committee, counsel is here by permission of the committee under the rules of this committee, and he has no right to make any statement whatsoever.

Under the rules he has the right to consult with his client, the witness, and advise his client as to his constitutional rights, and nothing else.

If counsel persists in violating that rule, then I shall ask that he be removed from the hearing room.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have examined the article that I referred to?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not asked you any question as to the content of it. My question was whether or not you have examined the article that I handed you. Have you?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. If you haven't, if there is any question in your mind, hand it back to him again, and I will ask him to examine it.

(Document handed to the witness.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I am not required here to give testimony that will lead to a chain against me.

Mr. MOULDER. We don't know. You have refused to look at the document referred to by counsel which has been handed to you. How do you know whether or not it would incriminate you unless you have had an opportunity to examine it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Therefore, you are requested and directed to examine the document referred to by counsel.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. My only question was, have you examined it?

Mr. DAY. And the congressman's question?

Mr. MOULDER. I merely directed you to examine the document.

Mr. DAY. I understand.

See, under this pretense, Congressman——

Mr. MOULDER. You can read, can't you?

Mr. DAY. I imagine so.

Mr. MOULDER. You are then asked and requested to read the document that has been handed to you by Mr. Williams and which Mr. Tavenner refers to for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to inform yourself when he might ask any question concerning the document.

It certainly wouldn't incriminate you to look at the document.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I understand this document; it's already been identified and put into the record, identifying me with the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. That isn't the point.

Counsel wants you to read a certain article——

Mr. DAY. Now have I any right to refuse to be identified here, to——

Mr. MOULDER. Did I understand you refuse to read the document he has handed to you for the purpose of informing you, and giving him an opportunity to question you about it?

Mr. DAY. I still refuse under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to look at the document.

Now do you decline to do so?

Mr. DAY. Sir?

Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to read the document, to examine it as requested by counsel?

I say do you decline?

Mr. DAY. I thought that was already. I decline to answer and identify myself.

That is all.

Mr. MOULDER. You are not asked to identify it. Counsel has asked you to examine it and read it.

Mr. SCHERER. The witness has had ample opportunity to comply with the direction of the chair. He has consulted with his counsel, and evidently received advice from counsel not to read or look at the document.

I suggest that we proceed with the next question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you hand me the document?

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Day, the article that I asked you to examine under the title of "Name CP Head" is as follows:

St. Louis, September 27.—John Day, returned veteran of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion in Spain, and resident of Joplin, Mo., was elected chairman of the district committee of the Communist Party of Missouri and Arkansas, at its quarterly meeting in this city yesterday.

Are you the John Day referred to in that article?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I decline to answer on the grounds given, the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a veteran of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. Counsel, could I appeal to Congressman Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. DAY. I want to be fair and answer the question fairly. And I am proud of my record in Spain.

There, I considered a people who had elected their government. The king had left.

And they were attacked.

Believe me, I saw the bombing of Mérida.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. DAY. I am answering your question, Mr. Congressman.

Am I right in telling you—Yes; I went to Spain. I served 17 months in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

And I am inordinately proud of it, Congressman Moulder. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party when you went to Spain?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you recruited for service in Spain by the Communist Party in St. Louis?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then this article correctly describes the John Day referred to as you, does it not, when it says John Day, returned veteran of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, when he says that he did go to Spain and fight in the Spanish Civil War certainly he opens the door to questions as to how he was recruited to go to Spain, who recruited him, the circumstances involving his going to Spain.

Therefore, I think you should direct the witness to answer Mr. Tavenner's question as to whether or not he was recruited by the Communist Party here in St. Louis to go to Spain.

And he has no right to invoke the fifth amendment in view of the fact that he said he did go to Spain.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

The witness is so directed. And the direction is not given in the spirit of a threat, as we have stated heretofore to other witnesses, but for the purpose of advising you, giving you an opportunity to avoid any possible prosecution for contempt.

Therefore, you are directed to answer, Mr. Day.

Mr. DAY. The answer is "No." I refuse; I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. The answer is what?

Mr. DAY. No.

Mr. SCHERER. The answer is "No," he said then, and the fifth amendment.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I withdraw that.

The answer is that I decline to answer on the grounds of it might incriminate me. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. SCHERER. I thought that was what you answered.

Will you repeat your other question, Mr. Tavenner. I was a little lax in not asking that the direction be made at the time you asked the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe I followed it with this question:

This article, in referring to John Day as a veteran who had returned from the Abraham Lincoln Battalion, described you correctly, did it not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Correctly referred to him?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DAY. I don't believe there is any question about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Then this article does refer to you?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I decline to answer on the grounds——

Mr. TAVENNER. You have just said there was no question about the fact of that, that it did refer to you. Are you trying now to change your answer?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I didn't intend so to state. I was——

Mr. TAVENNER. Why are you now changing your answer?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer that on the grounds——

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you told to change your answer?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live in Joplin, Mo., on the 28th day of September 1938?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question where he lived in 1938.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Let the record show that the committee refuses to accept his answer.

Mr. DAY. I am unclear. Is this the date mentioned in the article that you gave me?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the date of the publication of the newspaper.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. Then I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever lived in Joplin, Mo.?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I appeal to the chairman, and I would like to go along as long as I am not identifying myself with anything in this article.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are going along very slowly.

Mr. MOULDER. He asked over what period of time you resided there.

Mr. DAY. I was brought to Joplin as a child. My folks moved from Washburn. And I attended the schools there, the Emerson School in Joplin.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live there?

Mr. DAY. Well, it was a matter of several years.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long?

Mr. MOULDER. Approximately.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. About 24 years, I guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you leave Joplin?

Mr. DAY. Well, I left when I was a young man for a while, around 19 years old, and went up to Pittsburg, Kans.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live in Joplin in 1940?

Mr. DAY. I believe I was there a while in 1940. Not long.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long prior to 1940 had you lived there?

Mr. DAY. Prior to 1940: there was a period there that I was in Pittsburg, Kans., and then I worked down in Texas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's come right to the point.

Did you live there in 1938?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand you refuse to answer?

Mr. DAY. No. The answer is no, I don't think I was there in 1938, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then as of the date of this publication, September 28, 1938, you were not a resident of Joplin?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you elected to the District Committee of the Communist Party for the States of Missouri and Arkansas?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer——

Mr. TAVENNER. On September 27, 1938.

Mr. DAY. I invoke the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of the May 23, 1940 issue of the Daily Worker, and refer you to an article appearing in the left-hand column of the paper. Will you examine it, please.

(Document handed to counsel for the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And while he is doing so, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the photostatic copy of the September 28, 1938 issue of the Daily Record marked "Day Exhibit No. 1" for identification purposes and filed for the records of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. So ordered.

(The document referred to marked "Day Exhibit No. 1," was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. According to an article appearing in the May 23, 1940 issue of the Daily Worker it was stated that John Day, Spanish Republican veteran, will run for governor, and Marcus Murphy, local Negro leader, will be a candidate for lieutenant governor of the State of Missouri.

This was at the end of a State convention of the Communist Party of Missouri.

Were you a candidate for governor in the State of Missouri?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer that on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate for any State position on the Communist Party ticket?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you also a candidate for Congress from your district on the Communist Party ticket?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed at any time at Lincoln-Mercury plant?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DAY. I guess that is a well-known fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are employed there now, are you not?

Mr. DAY. I am employed there; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been so employed?

Mr. DAY. About 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. While employed there have you been a member of an organized group of the Communist Party in that industry?

Mr. DAY. Well, I refuse to answer that question on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions from the Chair.

You are excused as a witness, Mr. Day.

Mr. MACLEOD. I wonder if, at this time, the Chair would care to apologize for the untoward incident toward me as counsel here this morning.

Mr. MOULDER. Neither the Chair nor this committee will tolerate any disturbances or any attempt to harass the committee by statements from you.

You have been subpoenaed as one of the witnesses, and you will have an opportunity to testify.

Mr. MACLEOD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(The committee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thelma Hecht.

Will you come forward, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Mrs. Hecht, will you raise your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give before the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. HECHT. I do.

# TESTIMONY OF THELMA HECHT, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, IRL B. BARIS

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please.

Mrs. HECHT. Thelma Hecht.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-e-c-h-t?

Mrs. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. BARIS. My name is Irl B. Baris, the first name spelled I-r-l, the last name B-a-r-i-s, attorney at law, licensed to practice in the State of Missouri. I have offices in the Arcade Building in St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of St. Louis, Mrs. Hecht?

Mrs. HECHT. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly what your formal educational training has been.

Mrs. HECHT. I finished the eighth grade, and I have approximately 3 years of high school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since 1950?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I have no objections to telling about my occupation now, but I refuse under the fifth amendment to answer any questions on previous occupations.

Mr. TAVENNER. To make the matter short, over what period of time do you refuse to answer any questions as to your employment?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer as to anything that is not connected with my present employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present employment?

Mrs. HECHT. I am a housewife.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of the time you have been married, have you had employment in industry?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. On the self-incrimination provision.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer based on the clause in the fifth amendment, as to the self-incrimination clause.

Mr. MOULDER. Then it may help you for counsel and you both to understand, if you wish to claim that same privilege you may state for the record you decline to answer for the same reason, and it will be understood in the record that you are claiming the privilege under the Constitution as you have just stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Hecht, how could you conscientiously claim that it might tend to incriminate you to admit that you had been employed in industry at any time during your married life?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. I think that she must answer that question yes or no under the decisions of the courts because Mr. Tavenner is putting the question to her now which tests her good faith in use of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. As suggested by Mr. Scherer, you are directed to answer.

Mrs. HECHT. Will you repeat the question, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was:

How could you in good faith or conscientiously claim that it might tend to incriminate you if you admitted that you worked in industry at any time during your married life.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I feel that, based on the testimony of other witnesses and so on, that I feel that I want to claim the privileges of the fifth amendment because it might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you have referred to the testimony of other witnesses. Are you referring to the testimony of Mr. Cortor?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I refer to the questions that are directed to all witnesses.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor in his testimony identified you as the head or the leader of a group of the Communist Party on the West Side in 1951.

Was he correct in his testimony insofar as it related to you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. If that testimony be correct you are in a position to advise this committee as to the operations of an organized group of the Communist Party in this area at a very recent date. So I want to ask you whether or not you were a member of an organized group of the Communist Party at any time between 1951 and 1954.

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of an organized group of the Communist Party?

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name appeared in a notebook which was in the possession of James Sage on June 18, 1951. Your name appeared there as the head of a group of people who apparently, from the context of the notes, intended to go to Chicago for the convention held there on June 29 and 30 and July 1 sponsored by the American Peace Crusade.

Did you go?

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Sage confer with you about the matter?

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part did the Communist Party play in organizing the work of the American Peace Crusade in this area?

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer, and claim the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. HECHT. I refuse to answer, and claim the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

It is the feeling of the committee and its staff that if you would be so inclined, that you can be very helpful to the committee and your Government because we feel you possess valuable information concerning Communist Party activities in the St. Louis area.

As I said to one of the witnesses yesterday, the law does provide that this committee has the right, with the approval of the Federal court, to grant you immunity from prosecution if you will testify.

What is meant by that is this:

You have refused to answer all pertinent questions asked you by Mr. Tavenner, claiming that to do so might subject you to criminal prosecution. Now if that threat of criminal prosecution were removed by this committee so that, no matter how you answered the questions asked by this committee—no matter what questions were asked you by the committee—you could not suffer any incrimination, would you then answer the questions?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. The question is highly speculative as to what the future may hold, and I don't feel that I can answer any questions.

Mr. SCHERER. It is no longer speculative. The Supreme Court, just within the last 30 days, has held that this law, passed by the 83d Congress, is constitutional and proper and that this committee, with the approval of a Federal court, does have the right, as I told you a few minutes ago, to grant you immunity.

I understand the only reason that you are refusing to answer these questions is that you fear you might be prosecuted as the result.

If we remove any prosecution will you answer the questions then?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. BARIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this question relates to matters of a legal nature.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Baris, we respectfully ask you to permit the witness to respond to the question, as you understand the rules of the committee.

Mr. BARIS. I understand the rules, and I hope to abide by them as best I can. I merely wanted to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this is a matter seemingly of a legal nature and that perhaps—

Mr. MOULDER. You have, of course, the right to advise your witness on that.

Mrs. HECHT. May I not ask my counsel to answer for me?

Mr. MOULDER. No; you cannot testify through counsel or through any other person.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. Well, I have been advised by counsel that the Immunity Act has not been construed to House committees, and it is speculative as to what the committee or I may do in the future.

Mr. SCHERER. Of course, I disagree with your counsel's advice.

But let's assume that, that it does apply to congressional committees. And certainly the act does apply to congressional committees. It plainly states.

But let's assume that it does apply to congressional committees and you were granted immunity. Then would you so answer?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute.

Mrs. HECHT. I am sorry. I thought the question was finished.

Mr. SCHERER. No.

All I wanted to know is that if you are eventually satisfied by your counsel, if your counsel tells you that you can't possibly be prosecuted—

At some future date if your counsel should say, "Now I am satisfied that the law is such that you can't be prosecuted for answers that you give to the committee if they grant you immunity," will you testify?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. HECHT. This is a hypothetical question, and I cannot answer as to what I will do in the future, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. That is not a hypothetical question at all.

But nevertheless it indicates to the committee that you are not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith.

Certainly if you say at this point that the only reason you are refusing to answer the questions asked by our Government is fear of prosecution, and when you are assured by your counsel in the future that there could be no such prosecution if this committee granted you immunity, then, if you are invoking the fifth amendment in good faith, you certainly should say to this committee, "Yes, I will answer the questions."

So we can draw no other conclusion at this point than that you are not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith.

You just don't want to cooperate with your Government under any circumstances.

I have no further questions.

Mrs. HECHT. Was that a question, sir?

Mr. SCHERER. No; that was an observation.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well, Mrs. Hecht, you are excused as a witness.

And I wish to compliment your counsel upon the manner in which he has conducted himself and has made his appearance here as your attorney.

Mr. BARIS. Thank you, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should make this observation, Mr. Chairman, that what we have experienced with this last witness does indicate the fact that many witnesses who invoke the fifth amendment certainly do not do so through the fear of prosecution, but it is merely a planned program of the Communist Party to not give congressional committees any information concerning Communist activities, and that there actually in most cases is no fear of prosecution, but it is a means by which they hamper the work of this committee and use the fifth amendment improperly in refusing to answer.

Mr. BARIS. Was that matter directed at me or at my client?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. MOULDER. I think Mr. Baris was referring a while ago to the decision of the court when he said it was not applicable to this committee.

Call the next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Brockman Schumacher.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Schumacher, will you hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I do.

# TESTIMONY OF BROCKMAN SCHUMACHER, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, ROBERT L. WITHERSPOON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Brockman Schumacher.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Would counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. My name is Robert L. Witherspoon, member of the Missouri bar.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Schumacher?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. August 26, 1924, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the spelling, please, of both your first and last names?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. B-r-o-c-k-m-a-n, first name; S-c-h-u-m-a-c-h-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside, Mr. Schumacher?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. 4006A Maffitt, M-a-f-f-i-t-t, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in St. Louis?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. All my life, with the exception of the time I was in the service or in school.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you in the military service?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. From the summer of July 1942, to March of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I attended grade school and high school in St. Louis, Mo. I have a bachelor of arts from the University of Iowa, and a master's degree from Washington University.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your bachelor of arts degree?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your master's degree?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. 1952, the summer of 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in attendance at Washington University?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I went part time. I can't give you an accurate date. For about a year, the school year of 1951-1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since 1948?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer——

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment; I claim the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in the teaching profession at any time since you have received your B. A. degree?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer. And, as has been stated to other witnesses, the direction is not given in the nature of a threat but for the purpose of advising and informing you of the possible dangers of being guilty of contempt for refusing to answer.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. What employment did you have in 1954?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schumacher, did you at any time act as chairman of the meetings of the Civil Rights Congress in St. Louis?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the head of the Civil Rights Congress in St. Louis in 1954?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask do you know who was the leader of and head of the Civil Rights Congress during that year?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege to the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether, to your knowledge, the purpose of the Civil Rights Congress in St. Louis was to train recruits for the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether the work of the Civil Rights Congress was designed to educate its members for admission to the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you interested, Mr. Schumacher, in the forming of an organization designed to circulate propaganda regarding the return of our soldiers from Korea in 1952 when this country was in the middle of its fight in Korea?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you suggest to Mr. Cortor that he attend a founding meeting of the Save Our Sons Committee in Springfield, Ill., in 1952?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend that meeting?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. The same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Lou Kimmel was also sent from St. Louis to Illinois to attend that founding meeting?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of the fact that he was selected as a member of the continuation committee at that founding convention?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any effort made in the area of St. Louis to form chapters of that organization at any time between 1952 and the present date?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware of the trip of James Sage to the Continent of Europe in 1950 to attend the peace conference at Warsaw?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know Sage?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that you and he are very active in Communist Party activities.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Are you asking me or telling me?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. That is a question.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I am sorry.

I reassert the same privilege.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name appeared in a notebook in the possession of James Sage on June 18, 1951, at the head of a group of people

who were apparently intending to go to Chicago to the convention held there on June 29 and 30 of that year sponsored by the American Peace Crusade.

Did Mr. Sage talk to you about that trip?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go to Chicago?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. The same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. When did you get your master's degree from Washington University?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I answered that. 1952.

Mr. SCHERER. I had forgotten.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Oh, I see.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that the same year, 1952, that Sage got his master's from Washington University?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I don't know.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know Sage at Washington University when you were both there?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that he and you started your Communist Party activities while you were still in college, and continued them afterward? Isn't that a fact?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent was the Communist Party active in organizing this pilgrimage to Chicago in June of 1951?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard testimony here that you were the head of an organization known as the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee. Were you the head of that organization?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been introduced in evidence, as Cortor Exhibit No. 1, an issue of the St. Louis Defender, the masthead of which says "The St. Louis Defender, issued by the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee, May 26, 1956."

Are you still the head of that organization?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you Cortor Exhibit No. 1 and ask you whether or not you participated in the preparation of that document. (Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine Cortor Exhibit No. 1 and state whether or not you participated in the preparation of that document?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I have examined it, and decline to answer on the basis previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever see the contents of the document before?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, if you know, whether or not the Communist Party in St. Louis was instrumental

in the formation of the organization of the Progressive Party in St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I have no idea who started the Progressive Party in St. Louis.

Mr. SCHERER. Repeat your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether or not the Communist Party in St. Louis was instrumental in the formation of the organization of the Progressive Party in St. Louis.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. If he knew.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you know.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Communist Party instrumental in the organization of that party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. The same answer, the same as before—I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active in the Progressive Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I decline to answer that on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. The next question would be, then, did you participate in the organization of the Progressive Party in the St. Louis area?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I wasn't born when the Progressive Party was formed. It was formed by La Follette, wasn't it, in 1919 or something like that?

I think I told you I was born in 1924.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you about the St. Louis area.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I can't guarantee what happened to the La Follette party in the St. Louis area in 1919. I wasn't here.

Mr. SCHERER. I am talking about when you were here.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. When I was here.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you had anything to do with the organization of the Progressive Party in the St. Louis area?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. If the witness is confused about dates we may limit it to the period from the time of 1948 on.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. At least 1924. I was born then.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know we are talking about 1948.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I decline to answer on the basis it might incriminate me.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact, Witness, that you as a member, an active member of the Communist Party, participated with a number of other intellectuals in this community to form the Progressive Party about 1948 as a front for the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. This is a question?

Mr. SCHERER. Is that a fact?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. You are asking a question now?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer—same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of an organized group of the Communist Party while in attendance at Washington University?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party during the period of time that the St. Louis Emergency Defense Com-

mittee was in existence, which I think began in 1952, and is still in existence?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time I have not specifically inquired about?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you know Henry Holland?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I reassert the same privilege.

I recognized him when you called him up here a few minutes ago.

I didn't recognize him. I mean I heard you call his name, and I heard you give him testimony.

That doesn't mean the kind of knowledge you are talking about.

Mr. FRAZIER. What I meant is, did you know him before he testified here?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer.

Mr. FRAZIER. Were you at the University of Washington with him?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I never attended the University of Washington.

Mr. FRAZIER. I thought you got a degree from Washington?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Washington University in St. Louis, yes.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you attend Washington University with him?

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask one question of you, Mr. Schumacher, and that is this:

Do you know or do you feel that you are informed or advised as to the true objectives or purposes of the Communist Party in the United States?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Repeat your question, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, let's phrase it this way:

Have you formed an opinion as to the true objectives and purposes of the Communist Party in the United States?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. You have refused to answer the question as to whether or not you are now or ever have been a member of the Communist Party.

I will ask you this question, as to whether or not you believe in and are the follower of the Communist Party philosophy and its objectives in the United States.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. You asked me a question about my beliefs.

Is that it?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHUMACHER. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. MOULDER. Any other questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Schumacher, you are excused as a witness, and, likewise, may we compliment your counsel for the manner in

which he has presented and conducted himself as your attorney in an able manner while before the committee. Thank you very much.

You may claim your witness fees with the clerk of the committee.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Is that for both days I had to be here?

Mr. MOULDER. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Thomas Younglove.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you be seated, please.

### TESTIMONY OF THOMAS A. YOUNGLOVE

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Thomas A. Younglove.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Younglove, you have been in the hearing room, have you not, and heard the explanations that I made to other witnesses regarding their right to counsel?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Younglove?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. October 30, 1904, on the Ouachita south of Rappahoe, 7 miles south of Cloud Chief, geographically located now and known as the great State of Oklahoma.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside, Mr. Younglove?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Jefferson County and St. Louis County.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I am a contractor of concrete work, in business for myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Younglove, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you join the Communist Party at the suggestion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I offered my services to the Bureau before I became a member of the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association, which it was at the time I first got acquainted with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue in working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Until the summer of 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Equivalent to a high school education by doing homework with my children during the time they were going to school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you offered your services to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was contacted in my home by a man who lived in my neighborhood at that time, who had the reputation of being a member of the Communist Party. He came to my home. He encouraged me to take the names of nine of my neighbors which appeared on a card that he gave me, including my name, which made the tenth

one, and asked me to support our President Roosevelt in the next election, which was a few weeks following this, this being in the fall of 1944.

Knowing the man as I did, and really did, and not as I thought I understood him, I told him that I was not interested. And he told me, "You being a CIO member and a good trade unionist, you couldn't possibly support the Republican Party."

I told him I didn't care who he was.

"Tomorrow morning I may be sorry, but now I am telling you, to me there isn't but one man and that is Browder."

Mr. TAVENNER. This individual said that to you?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was James Ted Moore saying this to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. James Ted Moore?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He came in without me opening the door any farther.

He told me he was a member of the Communist Party. He enjoyed hearing me say the things I did.

He encouraged me to take some of the material that he had and read, one being the Daily Worker.

I also gave him—rather, I took a 3-month, I believe it possibly could have been a 6-month subscription to the Daily Worker.

That night, within the hour after he left, I wrote a letter to the Bureau here in St. Louis, and offered my services.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of that what occurred?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I attended some of the Communist Political Association meetings. I was visited at my home by members of the Communist Political Association.

After throwing them curve balls for a number of weeks, perhaps months, I signed an application at their request, and became a member of the South Side Club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall at this time who it was that solicited your membership?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The first being James Ted Moore, and a few days, perhaps maybe a week following that, I was visited at my home by Carolyn MacLeod and Marie Schmidt.

Mr. MOULDER. I didn't understand the first name.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Carolyn MacLeod.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of that you became a member of the Communist Political Association.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you fill out a card at that time?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which entitled you to membership in the CPA?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned at that time to any particular group of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I was assigned to the South Side Club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it a small or a large group of members?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Approximately 40 members. Possibly at times it could have been 60.

Mr. TAVENNER. Later I will probably ask you to give us the names of the persons you can now recall who were members of that group.

What was the date that you became a member of the CPA, the Communist Political Association?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It was in the year of 1945. I believe it was March.

Now I could be wrong. It could have been February. I hardly think it was as late as April.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Communist Party sometime later reconstituted and the Communist Political Association abandoned or abolished?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you continue on in your membership? That is, did you become a member of the Communist Party proper as distinguished from the Communist Political Association?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What changes were there, if any, in the work of these two groups? That is, the Communist Political Association and the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I noticed a great many changes during the time that I was a member of the Communist Political Association.

Meetings were open; records were kept; they referred to members as brothers and sisters; an active part was taken on the part of the chairman and the members in civic and patriotic affairs.

But after the reconvened convention in New York City when Browder was removed by the forceful article which called it to their attention by Jacques Duclos from France they went back to the Communist Party.

Meetings became closed, security measures were taken. The membership cards at a later date were discontinued. The many clubs in which they once operated were disbanded. They set up our country in geographical locations and districts and sections. I understand Missouri to be district 21.

Schools were established. Security measures were taken at all meetings that I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say that schools were established. Did you attend any of the schools?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I attended two schools and many educational classes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the first school that you attended?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The first school I attended was held in the 2800 block of Gravois.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what year?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The winter of 1945 and 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of that school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Teaching of Marxism-Leninism. It was school-room fashion: assignments were given; homework, study periods.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any of the particular subjects or books which were studied?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Many books were issued for us to read. I don't recall all of the books that were used in the teachings. However, I do recall History of the Soviet Union being one that was particularly used.

I recall this book clearly because I was instructed to buy this book from the Euclid Avenue bookstore, and a person behind the counter who sold me the book was at that time the State, one of the State or-

ganizers of the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association, which it was at that time, by the name of Helen Musiel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Helen Musiel?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Musiel.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the last name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. M-u-s-i-e-l, I believe, is the correct spelling.

Other books were used: State and Revolution; History of the Communist Party; Communist Manifesto; and Foundations of Leninism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall at this time the names of those who participated in the teaching at that school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. We had several instructors, one being Olive Heffner, Naomi Ring—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say Heffner?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-e-f-f-n-e-r?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Naomi Ring, a student at one of the universities at that time by the name of Melvin Ring—

Mr. MOULDER. It has been the policy of the committee as far as possible, when mentioning names to ask if you could give specific information, according to your knowledge. This might distinguish persons named from any other persons having the same name or similar names.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I understand, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say this person by the name of Melvin Ring was a student at that time at Washington University?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. No; I didn't say Washington. I said it was one of the universities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know which university?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; I do. The St. Louis University. A student in dentistry

Naomi Ring, his wife, was also an instructor.

I learned that they were from Brooklyn, N. Y., and they have since returned.

Mr. TAVENNER. To New York?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. To Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to this person by the name of Olive Heffner, do you have further identifying information relating to her?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. She is the wife of Roger Heffner.

We had another instructor at this school, an attorney practicing law in St. Louis by the name of Douglas MacLeod.

Mr. TAVENNER. Douglas MacLeod?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. There may have been others who taught for a short time, recalling one by the name of Ruth Paige. And I believe that Doug's wife Carolyn taught part time.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the same person who sought you out before you became a member of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Is she the wife of Douglas MacLeod?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of Ruth Paige.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you see Douglas MacLeod in the courtroom this morning?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did see him.

Mr. SCHERER. He is not here now.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't see him. I have my back to most of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of Ruth Paige. How do you spell the name Paige?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I understood it to be spelled P-a-i-g-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give any further identifying information relating to her, either as to her occupation or place of residence or anything that might prevent our becoming confused with maybe another person of that name or similar name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I understood this lady to be a social worker at one time. She is a Negro woman, apparently well learned or educated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that her maiden name or her married name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was her married name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where she is now?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I learned that she is in Africa. I don't know how truthful the source of the information is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other instructors that you can now recall?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't recall any other instructors at this first school, that is, as it was set up as a school. But in some of the debriefing sessions, or, rather, briefing sessions that we went through, and educational classes, there were others that I have not mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a Communist Party school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the instructors members of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, sir, they were.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Have I any information about that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. When I say "Yes," I mean all of them, with the exception of the one that I am giving and explaining about being—

Mr. TAVENNER. Wait just a moment.

Have you named that person?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I have named that person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Being a former dues secretary for the South Side section, and issuing dues and membership cards to the ones that I have mentioned, and the one perhaps I will later mention with the exception of one—I am asking for an explanation, and that is the lawyer, Douglas MacLeod.

The explanation is this: I never issued him a membership card. However, I noticed him to be in arrears with his dues in my dues book. And I asked Carolyn for his dues, and she told me not to bother with Doug, that he had been transferred to the professional group.

But he did attend school. He taught. And it was behind doors that were closed and locked, and the only ones attending the school were party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were all of the students who attended this school, members of the Communist Party or were some of them nonmembers?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was not permitted—to have a nonmember in a Communist school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that apply to this particular school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of some of those who attended this school as students along with you?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Paul Krooks, at that time being a student at the St. Louis University, was——

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell his last name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. K-r-o-o-k-s, recruited by Melvin Ring, was a student.

Olive and Roger Heffner were students.

Mr. TAVENNER. Olive and who?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Roger Heffner, being man and wife.

Bruce and Laura Miller, man and wife.

Joe Kozak, part time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Joe Kozak. Will you stop there a moment.

Can you give us any further identification regarding Joe Kozak?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I know him to be seemingly a well learned man. He indicated in the course of conversation that he was able to speak four languages. He has been credited with, from party sources of information, that he was successful in bringing about——

Mr. TAVENNER. You are telling us now something that somebody else told you? I mean is that, what you were about to say?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would rather for you not to state that.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I am sorry.

I learned that——

Mr. MOULDER. Was he present at the time?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Was he present at the time of the incident which I am going to speak about?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. No. I was not either. This occurred at the First National Bank.

Mr. MOULDER. I mean, what you heard from some other person. Was he present when the conversation was being had?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't recall whether he was or not.

We had another student there from time to time by the name of Louis K. England.

James Ted Moore and his wife Agnes Moore on occasion due to her employment being in the nighttime.

I believe Andrew Buckich did drop in from time to time.

Harold Edsell, James Cooper, Eula Mae Pearson.

Mr. MOULDER. As we go along, if you can, give a descriptive reference, some distinguishing identification, as you have in the other individuals named, if it is possible for you to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are speaking now of those who were students at the first school that you attended?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Now, if I understand you right, students in the school or students in some of our public learning places, our universities?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. Maybe you misunderstood my question.

I intended that your answer here relate to those who attended this special school that you had spoken of where you had named the instructors. If any of these persons you have referred to attended

courses of instruction that were different from this school I would want to make that plain.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The ones I have named were in attendance at this school from time to time. Not in every class.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Harold Hall?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, I do, and his wife Annabelle.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they attend this school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. They did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any occasion at a later date to know of the activities of Harold Hall in the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I have talked to him several times in and around party functionary meetings, and also at my club headquarters. Harold Hall is or was very active. He was considered a cadre.

Mr. TAVENNER. A what?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. A cadre, which is much higher than a party-level membership.

Mind you, in the party he was not a party functionary.

He is employed, or, rather, was employed by the Terminal Railroad Association here in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. If there are others you can now recall who attended this first school I would like to have their names.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The school lasted for many many weeks, with some coming in and taking instructions in the earlier part, and some throughout the time the school was held. I don't recall them all at this time. However, I do recall some being present who sat in from time to time.

Vera Scrotto and Russell Scrotto—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. S-c-r-o-t-t-o. And Roy Scrotto.

Sam Chinicci, who operates a service station.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that name.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. C-h-i-n-i-c-c-i.

And I believe John Pavlich—John Pavlich may have attended 1 or 2, possibly 3 instruction periods or classes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell his name.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. P-a-v-l-i-c-h, I believe, is the correct spelling.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you believed that he did.

Let me ask you this question:

Other than the possibility of his having attended this school, did you of your own knowledge know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. To my knowledge, I did. I have issued him membership cards.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that, whether your recollection is correct or not as to his attendance at this school, you know that he was a member of the Communist Party? You know that?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Just as sure as I know that there is not a second Tuesday in this week.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there others, whose names you can now recall, who attended that school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The school itself—I don't recall others attending. However, I believe I know—

Mr. TAVENNER. Do not state what you believe about it, please. If your recollection is not definite as to others attending, just say so and that would end it.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't recall others attending the school as defined as a school at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said that you were dues secretary. Over what period of time were you dues secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. MOULDER. Are you referring now to the South Side Club?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, sir.

I don't recall the exact time or the length of time, but it was in the period of 1945, 1946, possibly 1947. I don't recall the exact date on which I became the dues secretary or when I gave my dues book over to the one who succeeded me as secretary, which was Laura Miller.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the name of the person you succeeded in that capacity?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was Marie Schmidt, as well as I recall it. She was dues secretary. I believe State secretary at one time, and may have been at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your duties as dues secretary?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Collect dues from the members, assist in collecting sustainer fees imposed upon the members, funds that were solicited.

Mr. MOULDER. What were the dues?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Dues depending upon the amount of money earned or the pay the member received.

Mr. MOULDER. From his employment?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. From his employment.

Mr. MOULDER. What percentage was that?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I never understood it to be based on percentage. It was based on his weekly income. I don't recall what my dues were. I believe it was \$2 per month. However, some paid more, others paid less. The unemployed, I believe, paid 10 cents.

The sustainer fee imposed upon the members also was in relation with his income. I was imposed—I mean I was demanded to pay \$50 for the fees.

Mr. MOULDER. I didn't hear that.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I had a \$50 bill imposed upon me, sustainer fee, by the section, section-level heads. Mr. MacLeod.

He pledged through his wife, they pledged \$100.

Other demands were in relation to their income.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you call that assessment?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Sustainer fee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought you used the word "defense."

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Well, I did use the word "defense," and I will defend it.

Of course, I am going to have to testify as to what I believe from the circumstances.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean as to the use of the money?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The use of the money.

It was in defense of the Communist Party and to further their educational means.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is quite all right.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Thank you.

May I recall at this time—and add, too—some of my instructors at this school?

Mr. TAVENNER. I was just going to ask you that question. I wish you would proceed to tell us as to the nature of the instruction.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I recall one other instructor at the school—I recall at this time Marcella Oser, the wife of Nathan Oser.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the last name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. O-s-e-r.

It was Marcella Oser who contacted me and gave me the invitation or the request to come into this training.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the basis of your selection? What was the reason for your selection to this particular school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. She told me that I was not selected on just fitness and ability of being able to learn and reteach; that I was just a grand fellow or had some personal charm—I was selected on the basis of security.

She told me that I was not a member of the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the Catholic church. Had I been I would still have been on the outer edge of the Communist Party. I would never have gotten to its inner circle.

Mr. TAVENNER. She advised you of that?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not asked you any question about the nature of the instruction given at this school other than to ask the names of the books that you studied.

Is there anything that you can tell us about the type of instruction received in addition to what appeared in the books?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; I can. And this instruction or these comments were made by one of our instructors in the course of his instruction and teachings—Douglas MacLeod, being the man who was teaching at this particular time.

He said socialism would never come about by the use of a ballot box. We would have to use violent force and action.

Mr. TAVENNER. He made that statement before this class?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not functionaries from a higher level of the Communist Party appeared at this school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't recall them appearing as a teacher or instructor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything you can tell us about other instructions you received at this school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I recall one of the instructors by the name of Naomi Ring, during her course of teaching a particular class, asking the class how they thought socialism would come about. And she received an answer from one of the students that they thought it would come about by a powerful consolidation of organized labor led by the Communist Party.

Her answer to that was:

"Just don't kid yourselves. It will never come about that way. The stronger the power that labor has the more the capitalistic system will organize to defeat it."

And she hesitated for a moment, and she said:

"President Truman will drop the atomic bomb on the workers of this country to save capitalism."

That was soon after Hiroshima and Nagasaki received it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general purpose of this school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The general purpose was to educate the members in Marxism-Leninism, and remove the revisionist theory or thoughts that Browder had left with the membership during the revisionist period for approximately the last 2 years in which he headed the Communist Political Association. To reeducate.

Mr. TAVENNER. And indoctrinate?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said that you attended a second school.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that school held?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The summer of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was it held?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It was held at 1041A North Grand, party headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it a day or night school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Well, it was in the daytime. Perhaps there may have been some instruction given in the nighttime.

It was under the supervision and direction of Bob Manewitz who was at that time the State educational director of the Communist Party in Missouri. He had a number of instructors aiding him.

It was also schoolroom fashion with the aid of blackboards and a fairly well stocked library of Communist books such as I have mentioned before.

We were given an outline. We were given home study. We were given assignments.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general purpose of this school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. To teach the members the condition that must come about for a successful revolution in our country.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that school have a name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. It was named and called the Basic Training Institute.

Mr. TAVENNER. A Communist Party school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Oh, yes, definitely so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of the instructors in that school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Marcella Oser, Al Murphy, Haven Perkins, Clara Mae Perkins, and there were others I don't recall at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Helen Musiel was connected with that school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. She was connected with it, but I don't recall in just what capacity. She may have taught at one time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of any of the students you can now recall who attended that school.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The first one that comes to my mind this time is Mr. Joe Schoemehl.

Mr. MOULDER. You refer to students. You mean the names of Communists who attended the school? Communist students who attended this school?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. Schoemehl was one of those who testified for the Government in the Smith Act case; was he not?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And, according to his testimony in that case, he, like yourself, had been working in the Communist Party for the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I recall him being the one who registered the members attending that school.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you were working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Communist Party, did you know that Mr. Schoemehl was also doing the same thing?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first learn it?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I learned it by reading it in the paper. And that must have been at the trial that was held here in Judge Harper's court.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1954?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe that would be the date.

Mr. TAVENNER. And he was one of those who attended this school.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe Paul Forrester was also one that attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you believed that he attended. Let me ask you this as a preliminary question:

Do you know whether Paul Forrester was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did not issue him a card, but I know him to be at meetings where members of the Communist Party only were permitted. I know he was referred to as comrade.

Mr. MOULDER. At such meetings?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. At such meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you believe he attended. By that, is there some uncertainty in your mind as to whether he did?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; and the explanation for that uncertainty is this, that the time spent by me in and around party headquarters—This was not the only affair that was being conducted at State headquarters. There was other gatherings and meetings also conducted there in which I was present, party structure meetings, party functional meetings, organizational meetings. And it could be possible that I have got him placed in the school when he should be placed out of the school, the same as Romey Hudson, Richard Stanford or Ann Yasgur or Johnny Rossen. I have seen them all there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not mentioned any of those persons yet. So, since you have mentioned them, let us be certain about whether or not you are identifying them as members of the Communist Party.

Will you give us those names again, you have just mentioned, please?

You said Rossen?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Johnny Rossen and Louise Rossen, his wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they members of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. To my knowledge, they were.

So was Bill Massingale a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Upon what do you base your reasoning and your opinion?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The reason is based on this, that they were referred to as comrades by the chairman of the meetings, and by party

members that I know to be party members, and being doors that were locked where members of the Communist Party only were permitted.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you mentioned 1 or 2 other names.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The former educational director of the Communist Party; Ann Yasgur Kling, I believe, is her married name at this time.

And a girl that was active in the youth movement, Dottie Aukamp.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Dorothy Aukamp?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It is Dorothy. And I'm sorry I called her Dottie. I called her Dottie for so long.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her married name? Do you know?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Aukamp?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Seem like I learned it to be Sage. I could be wrong. I could be just as wrong as wrong could be.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been other evidence here in this hearing that her married name was Sage, that she was the wife of James Sage.

Mr. MOULDER. I would suggest, if you could find a logical place to stop, it is 12:15.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m., this same day, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder and Frazier.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION, TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, at 2 p. m., there being present at the time of reconvening Representatives Frazier and Scherer.)

Mr. FRAZIER (presiding). Mr. Tavenner, you will proceed with the witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a moment.

Counsel was consulting with me. Excuse me just a minute.

Mr. FRAZIER. Take your time.

#### TESTIMONY OF THOMAS A. YOUNGLOVE—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Before the afternoon recess, Mr. Younglove, you gave us the name of one person who attended this Basic Training Institute in addition to yourself, and that was Mr. Joseph Schoemehl.

Were there others whose names you can now recall?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I recall a party by the name of Morgan. I don't recall her first name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you, was this school confined to members of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you at this time recall the name of any other person?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe—I am reasonably sure that Paul Forrester was a student at this school, part time.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you cannot be definite about it. Is that it?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. No; I am not definite.

There were many party members who were in and around party headquarters at that time, who came in and out, some of whom went to the offices within the party headquarters, perhaps for business.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this individual, Paul Forrester, known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, whether he attended this school or not, you know of your own knowledge that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. By the very fact that he got through the door would indicate that he was a member of the party where there was a school being conducted at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but there was some doubt in your mind as to whether he attended this particular school, and that is the reason I ask that question; as to whether or not you had any information regarding his membership in the Communist Party other than being in this school.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I am not sure that he was a student at this school at this time. I can't place him; I can't see him. I am taking myself back some, almost 10 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know, independently of this school, whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know that?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. By him being referred to as comrade by party members, known to me as party members, and by seeing him in the party meetings where only Communists attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is Communist Party meetings other than this school?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend every lecture in this school or every session of it?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. No, I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it possible that there were persons who lectured at this school and who acted as instructors whose names you have not given us?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any other school of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was—those two that I have mentioned are the only schools that I have attended organized in schoolroom fashion with the aid of a blackboard and with instructors. However, I did attend a great number of educational classes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were those educational classes held?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Some were held at party headquarters, and in my own headquarters when I was chairman of my club, and at the home of party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the South Side Club of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. South Side Club. And I recall one being held at the Jeffla Hall.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of this type of training that you have just spoken of?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Indoctrinate the members' minds, sabotage the minds, and unite those sabotaged minds into one, and order them back into the jobs and professions they came from, fixing ill will and distrust between the rich and the poor, between management and labor, between the student and his teacher. And our training was to support and create any and all kinds of revolution against the social and political order of things.

Mr. SCHERER. When you say any and all kinds of revolution, was this one of the schools where they actually taught the mechanics of sabotage?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

One of my instructors, by the name of Marcella Oser, stated in class that a condition for a successful revolution was a condition that must exist, when organized labor was organized and led by the vanguard of the working people, and the masses were politically trained to follow. And, with a complete unification between the standing Army of our country and the Communist Party, it would never be necessary for them to take a defensive stand for the defensive stand is the death of all armed uprisings, and we should strike at the most vulnerable spots when enemies least expect us to seize power, when its forces are scattered.

The instructor was Marcella Oser. The place was 1041 North Grand, State headquarters, and the time was a period during the time of the Basic Training Institute.

Mr. SCHERER. Of course, we do know from evidence that they did succeed in infiltrating effectively the Armed Forces of this country.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have described for us certain changes in the organization at the time that the Communist Political Association was abandoned and the Communist Party was reconstituted. About that time or shortly following the time of the reconstruction of the Communist Party, do you recall whether or not very definite plans were put in writing by the Communist Party of Missouri as to the form which their organization, the new organization in the Communist Party should take?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I recall a number of pieces of material and printed matter that they passed out and distributed. I don't recall any particular one at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I call your attention to a document entitled "Proposed Plan for Missouri State Party Building Conference, March 2, 3, 1946." I hand it to you and ask whether or not you can identify that as a copy of one of the plans to which you refer.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; it is. And I recall seeing the original of this somewhere.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you identify that document as a witness in the trial of the first Smith Act case before Judge Harold R. Medina in the city of New York?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this document into the record of this proceeding.

Mr. FRAZIER. You may do so.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

## PROPOSED PLAN FOR MISSOURI STATE PARTY BUILDING CONFERENCE, MARCH 2, 3, 1946

The economic and political necessity as well as possibility to build a mass Communist Party is clearly indicated by the objective and subjective factors now developing in our country. These are, in the main:

Millions of Americans are completely disillusioned with the way the American people have been cheated from sharing the fruits of anti-Fascist victory. Promises of good jobs, homes and happiness made during the war have turned into bleak insecurity. Ask any worker, any GI—

"Our country is in a mess. Truman and Congress have botched up the job at home and abroad. The rich moguls have cornered all the wealth and don't care to run their plants unless juicy profits will continue as they did during the war. The working people are in for a hard time, unless they fight for their rights." This is the general opinion.

The recent strike struggles and the greatest solidarity between the Negro and white, between the workers and veterans shows that the masses are not only disillusioned but are also ready to unite and fight the monopolists.

However, the American working class is not receiving the type of leadership nor the kind of answers which would win decisive victories. For example: the worker who receives his 18-cent increase knows that this has already been eaten up by the rising cost of living. He still feels insecure and perplexed by growing problems in this postwar world. He knows that shuffling on wages and prices is no answer. He wants answers that will do away with fear of unemployment, do away with hand-to-mouth budgeting and worries. But such answers are not and cannot be given by trade unions. They are not given by the capitalist class and their agents in the Government. The only organization that can give these answers to the workers is the Communist Party. The Communists are the only ones who have the correct Marxist answers to the shifting wages, prices, and profits under capitalist economy.

The Communists are the only ones who can give a full program for the advancement, consolidation, and outlook of the trade-union movement and mass organizations of the working class. Reformist and social democratic leaders only confuse the trade-union workers and make their organizations ineffective, thus spreading a feeling of futility among the proletariat. The Communist Party is the only organization which has a program of struggle for the Negro people, for all minorities. The Communists are the only ones who have an answer to the threatening farm crisis and catastrophic collapse of agricultural economy. As a matter of fact, American imperialism is in such a state, is bent on such hellish ventures at home and abroad that no other organization but the Communist Party can properly deal with and combat its destructive aims.

But to do this job there must be more Communists. The present strength of the party cannot reach nor answer all these problems. We must extend party organization in every important sphere, but primarily among the decisive sections of the working class. That is why Comrade Foster so sharply emphasized the need of building the party, because "history will not take no for an answer."

Then a heading:

Our task from March 1 to June 1.

The National Committee has set a goal of 20,000 new members to be recruited during this period. Of these, they propose that our State organization recruit a minimum of 250. How shall we approach the party building at this time?

We must strengthen the weakest mass link by means of concentration.

In this campaign the aim of every comrade must be to recruit only those who will be active, who will contribute to achieve the following qualitative and quantitative improvement of our party organization.

First: Decisive improvement in the present shop organizations, and in building of new shop branches and clubs.

Second: Qualitative improvement in the existing neighborhood clubs and organization of series of new clubs in the important political and industrial sections.

Third: Decisive improvement with mass organizations of the working class, trade unions, NAACP, language organizations, etc.

The minimum requirements for fulfilling concentration tasks:

It is proposed that the minimum number of recruits shall come from the following industries:

Now before I read the rest of this document relating to various industries I want to stop and ask you if you recall or know just how this document was prepared.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I learned it was prepared after a conference held by party leaders. I do not know where it was prepared.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recognize this as a document that was circulated at your clubs?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, continuing to read the document, under the heading of minimum number of recruits from the following industries, I read as follows:

AFL—25, Electrical—25, Shoe—25 (including AFL shoe workers).  
Packing—25, including KC.

What does KC refer to?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It refers to the area of Kansas City.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Auto—15, including KC.  
Railroad—15, including KC. Outstate—25.

What does outstate mean?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Outstate means that the local industries or, rather, industries outstate other than the heavy industries as concentrated in heavier populated areas, there would be concentration made on outstate or scattered manufacturing plants.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Youth and vets—25.

Negro workers and professionals—100 as a generally minimum figure.

It is proposed that new branches and clubs shall be organized in the following places:

5 additional shop branches, at least 1 of these in KC;  
County clubs in Overland, Kinloch and Kirkwood—

Mr. SCHERER. Did you say Kirkwood?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Does that mean Kirkwood, Mo.?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain generally where the counties of Overland, Kinloch, and Kirkwood are located.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. They are located in St. Louis County.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Five ward clubs in St. Louis. Neighborhood clubs in Kansas City. Professional, at least one.

And the next heading is:

Organizational responsibilities:

Although the State chairman and secretary are mainly responsible for the recruiting drive in the State, every State committee member will be responsible for one or another of the concentration points during this drive.

Following are some of the proposed assignments: Electrical—Dottie—

The name Dottie appears. I believe you used the name Dottie in the earlier part of your testimony.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. And I recall that it was Dottie Aukamp who had that assignment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whose present name is Sage?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was wrong before. So I wait until you say it, because I could be wrong again. However, after hearing you say it, it is Dottie Aukamp Sage.

I recall Zollie having an assignment there, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wait until I come to that.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The next names appearing under that heading of "Electrical" are Zollie and Bill.

Who was Zollie, if you know?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Zollie Carpenter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know to whom Bill referred?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. No. There was a good many Bills. It could have been Bill Massingale—

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't say if you don't know.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. (Continuing to read:)

Shoe—Ray and Harry.

Do you know to whom those names apply?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; I believe I do.

When I was the secretary to the trade-union group in my section the shoe group was assigned to me, and that was Harry Mertz. I believe it is spelled M-e-r-t-z. And Ray, I believe—I could be wrong now—

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest if you are not definite and certain, that you not speculate about it.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't know the Ray referred to at that time—who that Ray was referred to at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Youth—Ray and Sue.

Do you have any recollection at this time as to the persons meant by the names Ray and Sue?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I knew a Ray Wolverson who worked in youth. And I recall a Sue.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean worked in the Communist Party in the youth work?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is what I mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. "Packing—Joe, Helen and KC."

Can you at this time identify the persons mentioned here as Joe or Helen?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I can connect Helen with the packing group for she worked at the Hile Packing Co. at one time. This Helen I am referring to is Helen Musiel, one of the State officers of the Communist Party at one time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing to read from the document, there is a heading "Some Club assignments: H. Tubman responsible for the 18 and 19th Wards, Packing."

Were you personally acquainted with H. Tubman?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Apparently that is referring to the Harriet Tubman Club. I know very little about that club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that is the name of a club rather than an individual—H. Tubman?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is right, the name of a club.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. So that club then was responsible for the 18th and 19th wards?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to this document.

Roosevelt—16th Ward—shoe.

That meant that that club was responsible for that particular area?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was my club and my area.

Mr. TAVENNER. "Tom Paine—Auto."

Does that mean that there was a Tom Paine Club of the Communist Party that was charged with the assignment of doing this recruiting work in auto?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. "Douglass—steel—Carr Square."

Was there a club known as the Douglass Club?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I understood there to be a club by that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. The next heading:

How Shall We Recruit?

1st—First of all, your own contacts in shops, neighborhood, and organizations.

2—Arrange for house meetings, club meetings, socials, etc.

3—Utilization of literature and folders that is being prepared by the national office, and any additional material that the local organization may get out during the drive, including the St. Louis Worker.

The State Board shall make available to branches and individual comrades all the leading personnel to speak to groups, to be at various house meetings, parties, and gatherings, to assist in the recruiting.

The Board shall also make available a list of desirable contacts, readers of DW—

What do the initials "DW" refer to?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The Daily Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Steps are already underway for organization of a school for all new recruits in St. Louis to begin March 20th. Similar steps should be taken in KC.

Individual pledges and responsibilities in all clubs and branches are a very important part of the whole campaign. The need for a day-to-day and week-to-week checkup on all assignments and pledges will be the only guarantee of a successful recruiting drive.

In order to keep the whole membership informed on the week-to-week accomplishments in the drive, a bulletin will be issued twice a month and mailed to all members.

Was the policy set forth in this proposed plan carried out?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Attempts were made, to my knowledge, of carrying it out. I don't recall how successful or if they were successful at all in some of their undertakings.

I do know I had assignments that were given to me by order. One of those was to turn in to the party headquarters the names and addresses of all shop stewards, business representatives of all locals that I knew of, and especially my own local, which at that time was the Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers Union.

Mr. SCHERER. Your own local, did you say?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. My own local at that time. I belonged to the Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers Union.

Mr. SCHERER. There was an attempt to infiltrate your own local then?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I make an observation at this point.

This witness has given us some valuable testimony, but the most significant part of his testimony is that which he gave a few minutes

ago when he said that this Communist school taught the mechanics of sabotage.

Now the Marxist study groups, the distribution of literature, the distribution of the Daily Worker, the net and final result of all these activities, I think, is eventually sabotage and espionage. And that is the reason I say that that is the part of his testimony that is so vital.

Mr. Counsel, you remember the testimony of Joseph Klein taken in Kansas City in 1954 in connection with the Albany hearings.

Klein was an active Communist Party functionary. He wasn't in the party at the request of the FBI. But he finally broke with the party. And his testimony was that as a Communist Party functionary first, and second as a union organizer he was sent to the General Electric plant at Schenectady to infiltrate the union there just as this witness said his chemical union was to be infiltrated.

Klein was asked why the Communist Party wanted to infiltrate that union, and he plainly said that in case of war with Russia, if we were an ally then, production would be more easily accelerated, and, if an enemy, then sabotage could be so much more easily accomplished.

Now is Klein's testimony given before this committee consistent with what you learned from your experience in the Communist Party as to the final objective of the party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Exactly.

And may I continue, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't know whether Mr. Scherer proposes to ask you further questions or not.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you mean you want to continue to answer the observation that I made?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Go ahead.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was told by one of the State officers of the Communist Party that my name would never be revealed as a party member. I was urged to keep my membership secret in the Communist Party for I was in a vital industry.

And I was further told, on the same occasion, that the membership list of the Communist Party was not kept at headquarters, but it was kept at a safe distance.

At a later date I was assigned to drive a man whom I had never met before in my life. He was from New York City. He carried a press card in his pocket from the Daily Worker. He operated under the name of Whirlwind Larson. And on the second day of driving this man through many, many parts of the city, and visiting many addresses, of which he had the list, he told me I was the most valuable comrade in this part of the country.

With the knowledge that I had of the explosives that I would use in the course of my work, and that at that time being in the natural-gas distribution system, employed by the Laeclde Gas Light Co., the industry and the distribution system that supplied all of the heavy industry and most all of the light industry here, that I could blow it up out of the ground and keep it blown out.

Mr. SCHERER. Wasn't it said often that in a city the size of St. Louis that all you need were about 15 trained comrades in espionage to make ineffective a city such as St. Louis, that is, comrades properly placed in communications and utilities?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was not said by Whirlwind. That was said—almost the exact words, only the number was less—by the State chairman, Ralph Shaw.

Mr. SCHERER. He said that you didn't need that many?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Not that many.

Mr. SCHERER. To disrupt a city the size of St. Louis?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. How many did he say you would need?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. About 5 or 6 well, highly trained, highly disciplined core party personnel.

Mr. SCHERER. Placed where? Utilities?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Utilities, transportation, distribution, and water-works.

Mr. SCHERER. I only ask these questions, Mr. Chairman, to point out the fact that there are so many people who say, "Why do you worry when they distribute literature? Why do you worry when they conduct Marxist study groups, et cetera, et cetera?"

I merely say that because the net and final result of those activities of the Communist Party—although many people who participate in them do not realize it—the net and final result is sabotage and espionage when the time comes.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did a time come in your Communist Party experience when you were asked not to attend meetings of the Communist Party, and to remain underground?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any advice as to whether or not you should be active yourself in trying to organize others into the Communist Party in this critical industry that you were in?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was told not to pass out leaflets or to expose myself in any way. The leaflets and the organizational work would be done by others. But should I learn or hear of someone who indicated that they were in favor of socialism or communism, to turn that name and address in to the party headquarters, and they would be contacted.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was the reason for all that security being thrown around you?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. To keep me for further or for future use should they ever call upon me or need me for this destructive job that Whirlwind Larson indicated that I would be so valuable to the party for.

And I was told by one of the press directors: Should I be picked up by the FBI and questioned if I belonged to the Communist Party, tell them yes immediately, but also, if you could, tell them in the same breath that you didn't believe in its teachings.

Mr. SCHERER. From your experience in the Communist Party, did you learn that this pattern that you are relating to us today, particularly in reference to infiltration, espionage and sabotage, is the same pattern that the Communist Party used in taking over the countries behind the Iron Curtain—that had been so taken since 1933?

Mr. Younglove. I didn't learn how they accomplished that. But I did learn that one of the main, true aims and purposes of the Communist Party is to establish beachheads in our country by the control of organized labor.

And in our discussion groups for infiltration and organization work it was stated many times they would prefer to have the leadership of an organization in a trade-union group than the rank-and-file members.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to a person by the name of Shaw.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. He was a member of my club, and he also was the State chairman. And Ralph Shaw would come to our meetings and our club meetings and speak to us quite often. I recall one—

I recall one meeting at the Jeffla Hall, and Ralph Shaw spoke. And during the course of his talk—and this was with the doors closed and locked—he said he had just returned from an out-State meeting and tour which he had made, and he had visited some comrades out-State who had guns and ammunition, and he had seen these guns and this ammunition.

And they are men who are ex-GI's and "raring to go," and they need a leader.

He further stated that the way the rotten old politicians are carrying on in this country that war may come about at any time. And, should it come about between this country and Russia, we must be prepared to do all we could to sabotage the war effort. We must be prepared to go underground.

He stated that: "We will throw the cargo off the ships. We will stab every bloody Yank in the back, and we will tear down the Stars and Stripes wherever it is at."

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, that is virtually the same testimony that we heard from Philadelphia as to the instructions that were given there, as to what should be done in the event of war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHERER. And yet we are abusing people's civil rights when we uncover these things.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you understand from your experience in the Communist Party, was its purpose in organizing these cells in the automotive branch of industry here, in the railroads, in numerous electrical concerns in industry? What was the purpose of the Communist Party in doing that work?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The purpose of it was to have men in a position who could sabotage, by strike or otherwise, to stop production of materials that our country would need so badly in case of defense. And the national officer of the railroad workers of the Communist Party stated, before a select group at State headquarters—and this man's name was Otto W. Wangerin. He was from Chicago. I can spell it, but I don't know if it would be correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what position he held in the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He was introduced by a man by the name of Herman Webb as being a national organizer for the Communist Party within the railroad workers. He also referred to that position in the course of his talk.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, we have made a great deal of inquiry about the formation of the railroad commission of the Communist Party. Very little information has been obtained about it.

Do I understand that you mean that the individual you mentioned was a member of the railroad commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He wasn't introduced as such.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he introduced to you?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He was introduced as the head of the Railroad Workers Unit of the Communist Party, and this being at a Communist gathering and all people present are Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that mean that he was a member of this railroad group or unit of the Communist Party on what level?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. National level.

Mr. TAVENNER. National level.

It would seem that that must mean the railroad commission of the Communist Party.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He came to—I hate to mention that commission with this person.

Mr. TAVENNER. The name may not have been used, but it may have meant the same thing.

Will you proceed?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He urged those to do all in their power to organize and infiltrate into the railroad workers, organize them into the party. And he stated, and he quoted that we could never, ever, hope to have a successful revolution unless we had the railroad workers with us because that was the lifeline of the capitalistic system that must be stopped.

Mr. TAVENNER. This plan, which I read into evidence a few moments ago, referred to the railroad group, and that plan anticipated that there would be 25 persons recruited, or that should be recruited at that time.

Do you know whether the Communist Party met with any success in recruiting railroad workers?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't know how successful they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any individuals who were recruited from the railroad group?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I know of one. I don't recall if he was recruited that time or if he was employed. I believe he was employed at that time, that being Harold Hall, employed by the Terminal Railroad Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not been in the Communist Party now for some years, but have you had occasion to know as of a recent date, what position, if any, Harold Hall holds in the Communist Party of St. Louis now?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I have no way of knowing that.

Mr. SCHERER. Was he still a member at the time the Government took you out of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The Government didn't take me out.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand you were an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation; were you not?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is right.

I probably misunderstood you. I am sorry.

Mr. SCHERER. It resulted from the Government's action——

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. In asking you to testify. Your identity was revealed. When was that?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The summer of 1949.

I learned through some printed matter that was distributed that I was an undesirable in the Communist Party, and I was expelled.

Mr. SCHERER. Was Hall a member of the Communist Party at the time you left the party, then?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Just prior to my testimony in New York City I knew him to be a party member, knew of him to be a party member.

Mr. SCHERER. It has been largely as a result of the activity and efforts by fine Americans like yourself that the things they advocated did not come about to a greater degree in this country.

You constantly made reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you not, while you were in the party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I made them as often as necessary for me to make them.

Mr. SCHERER. They weren't so successful over in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. May I comment on your observation?

Cardinal Mindszenty had a trial that lasted 40 minutes. The Communists in this country had trials that lasted for 40 months.

Mr. SCHERER. A good observation.

Cardinal Mindszenty couldn't use the fifth amendment either.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of your testimony you have given us the names of a number of persons who were active in one capacity or another in the Communist Party. We would like to have at this time the names of any other persons you can recall, giving as adequate a description of them as you can and as much of an account as you can of their activities in the Communist Party. In doing so try to refrain from mentioning again the persons whose names you have already mentioned. I know that would be a difficult thing because we have talked about people in particular categories.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I am taking my thinking back to my first experience inside of a Communist gathering, known to me to be a Communist gathering—by invitation—and that being the Tom Paine Club. And there I met Sam Manewitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sam Manewitz?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The father of Bob Manewitz.

I also met his wife; Sam and his wife I have seen at meetings that indicated to me that all were Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his wife's name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe it to be Esther. I could be wrong.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would the name Fanny mean anything to you?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That does register, and I believe that is right. That is Sam Manewitz' wife, and Esther would be the daughter, I believe, and the sister of Bob.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether there is a deportation proceeding now against Sam Manewitz and Fanny Manewitz?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I do not know. I wouldn't know.

In my club I recall the shoe group, the cell in the shoe industry: Cleo Whitaker, Tom Grimm and, I believe, a Bob Hogan, or Logan it could be.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that last name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Logan or Hogan. I believe it is Hogan, Bob Hogan.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said "I believe." Is there some uncertainty in your mind about that?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, there is, and I will tell you why. There are intermarriages there, and I am trying to get—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment before you explain that.

Do you know, from information not connected with the Shoe Branch of the Communist Party, that this individual was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I think it is perfectly proper for you to give us your best opinion about his being a member of this particular club inasmuch as you know he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was the shoe workers' unit within the South Side section and which I was chairman of for some time, later being assigned to the Sacco-Vanzetti Club out on Italian Hill.

The daughter of this person Bob Hogan married one of the men in the unit out at General Motors by the name of Marcelle Smith, who was a party member and in my section and in my club and which I collected dues from.

Also the man who was my instructor in materialism.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling of his last name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Smith, S-m-i-t-h.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry I did not understand.

You say your instructor in what?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Dialectical materialism.

This was the man who gave me my debriefing. He taught there is no God, and man has no soul, and religion is just an illusion, that our ministers and our priests are the tools of capitalism that were operating under political and religious illusions. The churches are the implements by which the capitalistic system uses to ease the pains as morphine administered by the doctor would ease the pain.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the Communist view taught you?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That was taught to me by a member of the Communist Party in one of these educational classes apart and aside from the schooling.

Mr. SCHERER. They also taught, did they not, that the greatest obstacles to the spread of communism in the world are the established religions, that they must be destroyed before communism could be really successful?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That must be according to their interpretations and their teachings.

We had further teaching on that, that when the time comes for the revolution that it will be necessary to open up the penitentiaries and jails. That was for two purposes, we were told: One, that, by treating the prisoners with a little kindness, that they would do the job the Communists wanted them to do; and, second, they would have a place behind bars that was open to put the military commands, the law-enforcement officers, our ministers, and our priests.

Mr. SCHERER. Did they leave out the congressional investigators?

Mr. TAVENNER. Now can you recall the names of other persons who were active in the Communist Party?

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you about the names of several people. I am not certain whether you have mentioned them or not.

Have you mentioned the name of Joseph Kozak?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes; I mentioned him as being a student at one of the first schools I attended.

Mr. SCHERER. Who was that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Joseph Kozak, K-o-z-a-k.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. You say a student at the first school. You mean a student at one of the first Communist schools?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. James Umstead. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I met him on a number of occasions in and around party headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell his name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. It is U-m-s-t-e-a-d.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you say about him?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I had met him in and around party headquarters, at party functionary meetings, and recall him being one of the delegates to the State convention which I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you mentioned a person by the name of Harold Edsell?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't know if I have or not. If I didn't I had him in mind for he was at one time the literature director for the South Side Section.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe at an earlier point in your testimony you mentioned the name of Andrew Buckich. How do you spell Buckich?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. B-u-c-k-i-c-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. Am I correct in saying you did mention him?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe you are.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether you did or not, was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I had issued him dues, a number of occasions. And collected his money. Also with him and his, I suppose, close friend or comrade was others by the name of Anton Perez——

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to state where you saw him, but was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Al Friedman?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I knew Al Friedman very well. He was head of the machinist unit in the Communist Party, and I knew his dues secretary, which was Marie Cuttier, and which I would pick up the dues from, being dues secretary of the section.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name? Marie?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Cuttier.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the last name.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. C-u-t-t-i-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Friedman is F-r-i-e-d-m-a-n?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. He is very active in the machinist unit of the Communist Party. As I recall, there were nine employed in the machinist industry, and tool and die makers, that were members of the Communist Party that I collected dues from.

I recall Joe Fite, Anna Fite, James Ted Moore, Al Friedman, and there were others I don't recall their names.

Mr. TAVENNER. I recall that you mentioned the name of Romey Hudson, but I do not recall in just what particular you mentioned the

name. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. By seeing him in party meetings where no others other than party members attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that you referred in your earlier testimony to a person by the name of Pasche, but I do not recall the first name. Am I correct that you did refer to such a person?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I don't remember, but Pasche, as I recall him, was a member of the machinist union.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his first name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Vic. I know him as Vic.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell his name?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe it is P-a-s-c-h-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say he was a member of the machinist union. Do you know whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I do know him to be a member of the Communist Party, and I was also told that he was a member of the machinist union.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you know of your own knowledge that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Seeing him at party meetings, referred to as comrade.

I don't recall giving him a dues card.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Hershel Walker?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Hershel Walker known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee anything about his activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. He was a member. And, as far as I knew at the time I knew him, he carried out the assignments that were given him. I have seen him on a number of occasions at the CIO Council.

Mr. MOULDER. You refer to the CIO Council.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. That is, the CIO Council is where the delegates of the many CIO unions met.

He was carrying out the orders that I received to attend the CIO Council.

Mr. MOULDER. From the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Merely seeing him there by itself would be no proof.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. No. I am sorry.

I don't want it to be an indication with anyone, that being a CIO member means that they are Communists.

Mr. MOULDER. That is my point.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is not true in any of our trade unions. Our trade unions are not going to the Communist Party, but communism was trying to go to the unions.

Mr. MOULDER. They, in turn, have tried to rid themselves of Communist Party members, and have done a diligent job, and I think have been very alert to it at all times.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The schools are not going into the Communist Party, but communism is trying to gain positions in our schools to destroy, disturb, and poison. Our ministers—the Communists would have us believe, through their rumors, part of their underground tactics, subversion by indirection through snide remarks and by rumor, destructive rumor and damaging—that our ministers are going into the Communist Party.

There has never been a case where the ministry has ever went to the Communist Party that I know of. It is a case where communism went to the ministry to be in a position to confuse.

Mr. MOULDER. My point was: the rank and file, as well as the general labor leadership, are anxious to rid themselves of Communist Party members and their influence. In fact, I have heard labor leaders here who have expressed an appreciative attitude for the hearings that are being conducted and for the reason that it will enable them to take action to help expel and rid their organizations further of this Communist influence.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. It is as a result of such testimony as yours that they will be able to do so.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was called to a trade-union trial where Al Friedman was tried before his labor union, and I testified what I knew about Al Friedman.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Younglove, you spoke of the CIO Council. During what period of time did you attend meetings of the CIO Council in St. Louis?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I believe it to be at the time I was a delegate for my union, and that was probably in the middle 1940's.

Mr. TAVENNER. About how many people constituted the council in this area at that time?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Many hundred.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand you to say you were directed by the Communist Party to attend the meetings of the CIO Council?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend as a delegate?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I attended as a delegate from my union, and also I attended, under their directions, meetings before I was a delegate and after I was a delegate.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the direction of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of the Communist Party in endeavoring to get representation on the CIO Council?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. The same as it was in any trade-union movement, to seek control of the council and direct its policies.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn, during the period of time that you were acting in behalf of the Communist Party in attending these council meetings, as to how many persons there were members of the Communist Party and acting under the same directions that you were acting under?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I was told by Bill Sentner, who was present one night prior to the meeting, our instructions were not to sit together. The Communists would not sit close to one another.

There were 14 party members who were delegates to the CIO Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. That demonstrates the effort that the Communist Party made at that time.

Mr. MOULDER. They had been successful to that extent in electing 14.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Did the general membership or the members of the union have any knowledge or information at the time of their election that they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Not at the time. But the experience that I had with my man that I worked with—he told me of my affiliations with the Communist Party, and under no circumstances would I be permitted to remain a member of my union if I continued my membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. That is my point, Mr. Younglove, that generally when seeking such an office in any organized labor union they never reveal their identity as being a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. They always conceal their affiliations with the party, and are elected under false colors without revealing that information or letting it be known to the general rank and file or the general membership of the union.

Is that so?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. That is correct. They conceal their party membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Sadelle Berger?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes. I met Sadelle on a few occasions, and I understood her to be a secretary at the time I was of the West End Club.

The Sadelle Berger you are referring to, the one I have in mind, is the wife of the attorney Sidney Berger. And I was told she was a secretary of the West End Club at the time I was dues secretary to the South Side section. I had met her a few times at party headquarters and party functionary meetings. The name registers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet her under circumstances that would indicate her membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Definitely so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware of the existence of a professional group of the Communist Party in St. Louis?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes, I knew such a group existed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend one of its meetings?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Oh, no. I was assigned to labor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, are you unable to state anything with regard to the membership of the professional group?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. I can restate what I have stated or testified to earlier, that I was told——

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't state what you were told.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, Mr. Counsel, as long as what he was told doesn't involve the identification of any individuals I don't see why we can't have that testimony.

We are not bound by the rules of evidence.

I would agree that if what he was told would involve the identification of some individual as a member of the Communist Party, then he should not testify to it. But if he was told something about the organizational activities and plans of the professional group, then I think we have a right to hear that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I thought my question related to the members of the professional club. If he intended to answer something other than the identification of individuals that would be within your ruling.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you intend to tell us something about the organization of the group, or did you intend to tell us something about personnel in the group?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Personnel.

Mr. SCHERER. The identification?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner is right then.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't think he ought to speak on that.

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that is all I desire to ask the witness, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Just one observation.

Earlier today Mr. Tavenner mentioned the testimony of Captain Nicolai Khokhlov, former officer in the Russian Intelligence, who defected to the West in 1954 and who testified before this committee that only 2 percent of the Russian people were members of the Communist Party.

That testimony, together with the testimony of Mr. Younglove, the present witness, is a complete answer to those who charge that the committee is exaggerating the Communist menace because there are so few Communists in this country.

I think the testimony of Khokhlov and the testimony of this witness completely refute that charge.

Of course, there is an abundance of other testimony available. I merely mention it because we have this witness here and we have had reference earlier today to the testimony of Captain Khokhlov.

Numbers mean very little.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Younglove, during the 8 years I have continuously served on this committee I have never heard testimony that was more impressive—and, I think, more straightforward and more honest and dependable than yours.

I am sure I express the feelings of this entire committee when I say, as chairman of the subcommittee, we are deeply grateful to you, and I am sure the American people and the people of the city of St. Louis are also grateful and deeply appreciate the information and knowledge which you have given to this committee as well as to the public concerning Communist activities in this area and the dangers that will result therefrom.

I reiterate our deep gratitude and our commendation to you for your courage and the sacrifice you have made for the American people and our Government of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. I certainly concur in your sentiments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRAZIER. We all do.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Younglove.

The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

Pardon me, Mr. Younglove, did you have something to say?

Mr. YOUNGLOVE. Would it be in order if I say to the committee I am very grateful for this time that has been given me to come to your committee, and if I have testified poorly or spoken poorly it is because you gentlemen have listened so well.

I feel like I am picking up where those boys left off over in Korea who are not coming back.

I do not wish to collect my witness fee.

The best of success, and good luck, and lots of it to all of you, especially on cooperation of the witnesses.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you, Mr. Younglove.

The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken, there being present at the time of the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call your next witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Orville Leach.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please, Mr. Leach.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LEACH. Yes, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF ORVILLE LEACH, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, IRL B. BARIS

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. LEACH. Orville Leach.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. BARIS. My name is Irl B. Baris. For the record again, I spell my first name I-r-l, last name B-a-r-i-s. Attorney at St. Louis with offices in the Arcade Building.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Leach?

Mr. LEACH. In Missouri; 1906.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. LEACH. In Missouri.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where in Missouri?

Mr. LEACH. Ellsinore, E-l-l-s-i-n-o-r-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Try to speak a little louder, if you please.

Do you now reside in St. Louis?

Mr. LEACH. In St. Louis County.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in St. Louis County?  
(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Approximately.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not interested in knowing right to the exact day. Just in a general way.

Mr. LEACH. About 20 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. LEACH. Well, rural school and 1 year of high.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present employment?

Mr. LEACH. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present employment?

Mr. LEACH. I am a machinist.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a machinist?

Mr. LEACH. Well, I wouldn't just exactly know. A number of years.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been employed as a machinist in your present employment?

Mr. LEACH. A little over 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom are you employed?

Mr. LEACH. American Car Foundry.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed prior to 2 years ago?  
(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. I have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't have to decline.

Mr. LEACH. On the basis of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you decline on that basis?

Mr. LEACH. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the City Labor Council in the city of St. Louis within the past 6 months?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. I will have to assert the privilege reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You certainly do not have to do it. The question is do you?

Mr. LEACH. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do?

Mr. LEACH. I do, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, do you honestly contend that to tell us whether or not you are a member of the City Labor Council in St. Louis would tend to or might tend to incriminate you?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. Will you restate that question, please?

Mr. SCHERER. You refused to answer Mr. Tavenner's question as to whether or not you were a member of the City Labor Council of

the City of St. Louis. Therefore, in compliance with the Supreme Court decisions, I ask you whether or not you honestly contend, honestly believe that to answer that question might tend to incriminate you.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Don't you think that is a reflection on the City Labor Council to say that to answer about your membership in that council might incriminate you?

Mr. LEACH. I feel that I am justified in asserting my previous reason.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask you a question, then?

Pardon me for interrupting, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Proceed.

Mr. MOULDER. What is that? What is the City Labor Council of St. Louis? What is its function and what is it composed of?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. I will assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that you direct the witness to answer the question asked by Mr. Tavenner; whether he is or is not a member of the city labor council.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

And the reason for your direction is to call it to your attention that we do not accept your reply, and for the additional reason to advise and inform you that it might endanger you to be in a position of being in contempt.

Therefore, you are directed to answer.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to what is the City Labor Council of the City of St. Louis. Certainly, to tell us what it is couldn't possibly incriminate him.

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed.

I say you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Any additional questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. You understand, Witness, that the question was: What is the council? What is its organizational setup? That is all that was asked. We didn't even ask whether you were a member or not.

Do you understand the question?

Mr. MOULDER. The question now pending is: Do you understand that question. Surely you can answer that.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I don't know of any labor council by the name of "City Labor Council."

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the correct name of the labor organization to which delegates are sent from the various labor unions in the city of St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You say it is not the correct name. Give us the correct name, please.

I don't see how in the world you can use that much time to answer a question as simple as that.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. See I don't know of any labor council by the name of "City Labor Council."

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any group—

Mr. LEACH. I don't see how I can answer on a thing like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then let me ask you to give us the correct name of any representative group of labor there is that meets in the city of St. Louis composed of representatives of labor unions.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. The witness is quibbling now. Instead of City Labor Council it might be Labor City Council or St. Louis Labor Council. Or Joint Council.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. I am sorry, but I believe I have to refuse. I am going to refuse on the basis previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question. Certainly we do not accept his answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you were employed by American Car & Foundry. In order to be an employee at that industrial plant is it necessary to be a member of the union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this witness is deliberately trying to delay this proceeding.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, I think the record should show that on each question he has conferred an unreasonable length of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have measured it by the clock, and on several occasions it's been between 2 and 3 minutes to answer the most simple question which he could have answered immediately, even by the use of the fifth amendment, if he desired.

Mr. MOULDER. Let's proceed as rapidly as possible. I hope the witness will cooperate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. LEACH. The question is what?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you forgotten it?

Mr. LEACH. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was whether or not to be an employee at the American Car & Foundry it is necessary to be a member of a labor union. "Yes" or "No."

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is not the American Car & Foundry organized by a steelworkers' union? Won't you answer that yes or no?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. LEACH. I am going to assert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you made up your mind you will not answer any question this committee propounded to you?

Did you come here with that determination?

Mr. LEACH. I have answered some questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you one of those who attended the meeting several days ago to determine whether or not witnesses would answer questions proposed by this committee?

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question.

▶ You can't possibly incriminate yourself by attending a meeting to discuss how you are going to testify unless you agreed to lie.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. You have here a clear example of what I said before, of abuse.

Mr. LEACH. I assert my previous reason.

Mr. MOULDER. You do what?

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Leach, weren't you a delegate from the steelworkers' local, of which you are a member, to a labor council in the city of St. Louis within the past 6 or 8 months?

Mr. LEACH. I refuse to answer that question on the basis of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't your——

Mr. SCHERER. Just a moment.

How could a witness possibly incriminate himself if he was a delegate to what is apparently a fine, good, honorable organization such as the Labor Council of the City of St. Louis?

It may be the Joint Labor Council. We may not have the exact name. But everybody in this room knows what we are talking about. And certainly a delegate to the council should know.

There is clearly an improper invocation of the fifth amendment, and I ask that you direct the witness to answer because I feel that this witness is in contempt of this committee, in contempt of the Congress, for taking the position he has on these questions.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer.

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't your credentials refused at that meeting, and weren't you denied the right to attend, to sit as a delegate?

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time within the past year?

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Did I understand, Mr. Tavenner, that the Labor Council refused to seat him as a delegate?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is my information that his credentials were challenged, and that he was not seated.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that information correct, Witness?

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. SCHERER. It is evidently correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name has been found, Mr. Leach, in a memorandum book that was in the possession of Mr. James Sage on June 18, 1951. Your name appeared as the head of a group of individuals under circumstances indicating that they proposed to make a trip to Chicago on June 28 and 29 of 1951 to attend a convention sponsored by the American Peace Crusade.

Did you attend that convention?

Mr. LEACH. I am sorry I have to assert the previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Sage?

Mr. LEACH. I have to assert the previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Sage obtain your approval to take your car and a group of people to go to Chicago?

Mr. LEACH. I will have to assert the previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it the Communist Party that organized this caravan to Chicago to attend the American Peace Crusade convention?

Mr. LEACH. I can't answer that question because I feel that under the fifth amendment I am entitled to that right of protection.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you do refuse to answer on the grounds that to do so might tend to incriminate you. Is that your answer?

Mr. LEACH. I gave you my reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. Your reason was that you couldn't. You can answer the question.

I ask you whether you do refuse to answer.

Mr. LEACH. I do refuse to answer on that grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received testimony that you were a member of one of the industrial units of the Communist Party organized in St. Louis. Did you hear that testimony? A witness referred to it as being the electric fraction of the Communist Party.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Will you name the witness you are referring to, Mr. TAVENNER.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor.

Mr. LEACH. My attorney advises me that that testimony came yesterday, and I was not here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. Cortor testified that he met in Communist Party fraction meetings of the electric group of the Communist Party and that you attended those fraction meetings, indicating that you were a representative of an organized group of the Communist Party in one of the industries represented there.

Was that testimony true or was it false?

Mr. LEACH. I am going to refuse to testify as to that under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to give this committee any information regarding the activities of the Communist Party in industries in this area. Is that the position you are taking?

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it?

Mr. LEACH. I assert my previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. LEACH. I assert my previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active in the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. LEACH. I refuse to answer that question on the basis of possible self-incrimination, and invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEACH. I assert the previous reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier, any questions?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Zollie Carpenter.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CARPENTER. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF ZOLLIE C. CARPENTER

Mr. CARPENTER. I have a prepared statement I would like to read, if I may, please.

Mr. MOULDER. It has been the rule of the committee that it would delay the proceedings to such an extent it would be impossible to conduct hearings, but witnesses are permitted to file statements if they so desire.

If you wish to give one of the investigators the copy of your statement it will be made a part of the records of this committee.

(The statement referred to was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. CARPENTER. Zollie C. Carpenter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Carpenter, it is our practice to advise each witness that he has the right to have counsel with him if he so desires, and to consult with counsel at any time during the course of his interrogation.

Mr. CARPENTER. I don't have counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am informing you as to your right in the event you desire to exercise it.

When and where were you born, Mr. Carpenter?

Mr. CARPENTER. January 3, 1906, in Craighead County, Ark.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a resident of St. Louis?

Mr. CARPENTER. Beg pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a resident of St. Louis?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

Mr. CARPENTER. Approximately 28 years, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. CARPENTER. It is about equivalent to a grade school education because where I was born and at the time the school facilities were very bad. I mean——

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present employment?

Mr. CARPENTER. I work at Wagner Electric Corp.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Carpenter, the investigation which the committee staff has made indicates that you are not now a member of the Communist Party. Is our investigation correct on that?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would refuse to answer that question on the grounds that anything I may say may tend to incriminate me, and I plead the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. That couldn't possibly incriminate you when I tell you that it is our judgment that you are not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CARPENTER. I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not even admit that you are not a member of the Communist Party. Is that right?

Mr. CARPENTER. I plead the fifth amendment, that anything I may say may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have made up your mind you will not answer any question relating to the subject of communism. Is that it?

Mr. CARPENTER. I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not give this committee any information on the activities of the Communist Party in this area?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would have to plead the fifth amendment because anything I may say may tend to incriminate me. I do plead it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Regardless of the fact of whether you may or may not be a member of the Communist Party at this time, were you a member of the Communist Party in 1946?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer on the grounds I mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear me read into the record a document prepared by the leaders of the Communist Party in the State of Missouri, in which assignments were set forth, in writing, for various individuals to different groups of the Communist Party? Were you present?

Mr. CARPENTER. I was in the hall.

Mr. TAVENNER. In that document which I read it is stated that there should be assigned to leadership in the electrical unit of the Communist Party a person by the name of Dottie and a person by the name of Zollie.

Zollie is your first name, is it not?

Mr. CARPENTER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to the electrical unit of the Communist Party as indicated by this document?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would like to plead the fifth amendment on that question, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the person referred to as Dottie, Dottie Sage?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse on the grounds that I may incriminate myself, fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer on the grounds that anything I may say may tend to incriminate me, and, therefore, I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is quite possible that we of the staff then are wrong about our estimate of you.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know the objects and purposes of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would like to plead the fifth amendment on that question, please, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. If you were advised and informed and convinced that the Communist Party movement within the United States was to ultimately conspire to participate in the international conspiracy to make this a Communist world and that they hoped to bring this country under the domination and complete influence of the Soviet Union would you then favor or believe in the Communist Party purposes and objectives? Would you approve their purposes and objectives? I will put the question that way.

Mr. CARPENTER. How did you ask that question? You mean if this country would be invaded? Was that right?

Mr. MOULDER. The question was would you approve of the ultimate objective and goal of the Communist Party, to bring our country under the domination and influence and complete control of the Soviet Union as a part of the international conspiracy to control the world.

Mr. CARPENTER. I would like to plead the fifth amendment because anything that I might say might incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. What official position did you hold in the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America in 1951?

Mr. CARPENTER. In 1951?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CARPENTER. Let's see.

I don't recall. I believe I was——

Mr. TAVENNER. How is that?

Mr. CARPENTER. Let's see.

I belonged to the Electrical Workers in 1951 in the CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder, please.

Mr. CARPENTER. I at one time belonged to the UE, and am now a member of the IUE-CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1951 were you a member of the UE?

Mr. CARPENTER. I don't recall the exact date on that. I will have to——

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you were a member of the UE did you hold an official position in your local?

Mr. CARPENTER. Various ones. I mean like shop steward.

Mr. TAVENNER. Such as shop steward?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any position higher than shop steward?

Mr. CARPENTER. Board member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold a higher position than board member?

Mr. CARPENTER. Not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever president?

Mr. CARPENTER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. What positions did you hold other than shop steward and board member?

Mr. CARPENTER. I don't recall offhand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't the UE have positions that were called trustees?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you a trustee?

Mr. CARPENTER. That is right; I was a trustee in the last part of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did the UE adopt or have the position of trustee?

Mr. CARPENTER. They always did.

Mr. TAVENNER. They always did?

Mr. CARPENTER. All the unions that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your duties as trustee?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer any further than that, on the ground it might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a trustee you were required, under the law, to sign the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavit; were you not?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Here is your affidavit of February 5, 1951. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not that is your signature? And also a second one of December 18, 1951.

(Documents handed to the witness.)

Mr. CARPENTER. Just a minute, will you, please. Shall I have a drink of water?

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

I will ask that the first document be marked for identification as "Carpenter Exhibit No. 1," and the second one as "No. 2."

Mr. MOULDER. The first document will be marked "Carpenter Exhibit No. 1," and the second document, "Carpenter Exhibit No. 2," as requested by counsel.

(The documents referred to were marked "Carpenter Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2" for identification.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recognize your signature on either of those documents?

Mr. CARPENTER. That is my signature on the document. And I think that, since I am not a person that goes around violating the law purposely, I think the record can stand for itself, answer for itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that record speak the truth as of that date?

Mr. CARPENTER. It did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not a member of the Communist Party on February 5, 1951?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer on the grounds that I might intimidate (sic) myself.

Mr. SCHERER. You are a little confused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

You said that the documents spoke the truth.

Mr. CARPENTER. Speaks for itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said it spoke the truth.

Mr. CARPENTER. It speaks for itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. You said it spoke the truth.

This is what the document says:

I am a responsible officer of the union named below. I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party.

Is that statement true, at the time you made it?

Mr. CARPENTER. It would have to be if I signed my signature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then it was true and you were not a member of the Communist Party. Is that correct?

Mr. CARPENTER. It stands for—that signature should—

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking you anything about your signature I am asking you to state under oath now whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party at the time you signed this affidavit, which was February 5, 1951.

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse on the grounds that it might intimidate (sic) me because I believe the signature should stand good for it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a minute.

Which is it?

The two things are inconsistent. You are saying, in one breath, that the signature stands for your having told the truth, or, in substance, that; and you are saying you will not say whether it was true or not. You can't blow hot and cold in the same breath.

Which is it? True or false?

Mr. CARPENTER. I think the document will stand for itself, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. My question was were you a member of the Communist Party on the 5th day of February, 1951.

Mr. CARPENTER. If I signed an affidavit that I wasn't then I wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Answer the question specifically.

Mr. Chairman, may I have a direction that the witness answer the question?

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question and give a direct response to the question, and not be evasive.

Mr. TAVENNER. The question is:

Were you a member of the Communist Party on the 5th day of February 1951?

Mr. CARPENTER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on the 18th day of December 1951?

Mr. CARPENTER. What was the first date there?

Mr. TAVENNER. February 5, 1951.

Mr. CARPENTER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time since December 18, 1951?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer on the grounds that anything I might say might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on the 4th day of February 1951?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to—

Because I don't remember dates, and you have the dates, I refuse to answer that question on—

Mr. TAVENNER. Because you don't remember dates. In other words, there was a date very close to the signing of this affidavit on February 5, 1951, when you were a member of the Communist Party, wasn't there?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer any further because you have got me tangled up on dates there, and I can't remember the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you can easily get confused on dates. I am trying to help you to refresh your recollection of dates.

You were not a member of the Communist Party, you said, on the 5th day of February 1951, and now I ask you if the day before that, on the 4th, you were a member, and you said you were confused about the exact dates, and, therefore, you didn't want to answer.

So I am asking you now how close to February 5, 1951, was it that you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CARPENTER. I will have to refuse to answer that because I don't—anything I say I may incriminate myself, and I will have to plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you plead the fifth amendment to that?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually did you have an understanding with the leadership of the Communist Party that you would not consider yourself a member merely for the purpose of signing this affidavit?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did the Communist Party advise you to do about signing this affidavit?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer that on the grounds it might incriminate myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you were not a member of the Communist Party at the time of the second affidavit, which was December 18, 1951.

Were you a member of the Communist Party on the following day, the 19th of December?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer any questions on that because—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you resign the day before, sign the affidavit, and then join the next day like some did? Is that what you did?

Mr. CARPENTER. Not the day before, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not the day before, but how many days before was it that you did that?

Mr. CARPENTER. I refuse to answer on the grounds that it may incriminate myself.

Mr. MOULDER. Is that all, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am very sorry that you have not seen fit to advise the committee of methods used by the Communist Party in the handling of these non-Communist affidavits. It has been the subject of a great deal of study by this committee. It was the basis of the recommendation by this committee of the Communist Control Act of 1954.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you think, Mr. Counsel, that this witness possesses sufficient information on that subject that would warrant us in granting him immunity?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am inclined to think, in light of his answers, that he does.

Mr. CARPENTER. I am sorry. You will have to talk louder.

Mr. SCHERER. I will explain.

You have refused to answer the pertinent questions asked you by Mr. Tavenner on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate you. In other words, if you answered the questions the answering of

those questions might tend in some way to subject you to a criminal prosecution.

As I explained to one or two previous witnesses, the law now provides that this committee may grant you immunity from prosecution if you answer the questions. In other words, this committee, with the approval of a Federal court, may say go ahead and answer the questions, and then, when you answer the questions, you cannot possibly suffer any criminal prosecution.

Now, as I understand it, your sole reason for refusing to answer the questions—I don't want to be repetitious—is the fact that you might suffer criminal prosecution. If we remove that possibility by granting you immunity, which we have the right to do under the law, would you then answer the questions? Because we feel you have some information on this subject of the signing of non-Communist affidavits which would be very helpful to the Government.

Mr. CARPENTER. I feel that I would have to refrain from answering the questions, that the answer may tend to intimidate (sic) me, and, therefore, I would plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Obviously you don't understand what I am trying to tell you, and I perhaps don't blame you. Maybe I didn't make it very clear.

Mr. MOULDER. I think Mr. Scherer has made a very clear statement and explanation to you. However, I will say that I don't think you need immunity. If you answer the questions that have been propounded to you fairly and honestly and clearly and without evasion you would not be subject to prosecution for so testifying without immunity.

Proceed with your explanation, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. In view of what Mr. Tavenner said, this matter has been the subject of investigation by this committee and that we are considering legislation and that this witness does have some information as to the Communist Party's instructions with reference to signing non-Communist affidavits under the Taft-Hartley law, we do feel you have valuable testimony.

Did you understand what I tried to say to you before? You are refusing to answer these questions, and you have a right to refuse to answer them if you honestly believe that to answer them might lead to a criminal prosecution. That is your reason for refusing to answer. Is that not right?

Mr. CARPENTER. That is.

Mr. SCHERER. If we remove any prosecution by giving you immunity, which we have the right to do, so that you don't have to fear prosecution no matter what you say, then would you be willing to answer the questions?

Do you understand what I am trying to tell you?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. You understand what I am trying to say.

Now can you answer the question, namely, would you then answer?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would like to refuse to answer any questions in regard to such on the grounds that I may incriminate myself, tend to incriminate myself, and plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. I should certainly direct you to answer the question Mr. Scherer has asked you. What is your answer to that question? He asked you whether or not, if you were granted immunity, you

would testify. He made a very lengthy and clear and convincing explanation of it.

Would you so testify if you were granted immunity?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would have to plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

Mr. SCHERER. May I say one more thing.

Do you think perhaps if you talked to an attorney or counsel——

Would you want to do that?

I think you are a pretty nice fellow. I think you are out of the party.

I think he has gotten out of the party.

It may be just a little confusing. I think he has some information that would be helpful to this committee.

I don't desire to see this man prosecuted even if he answered without immunity.

What I am saying is would you want to consult an attorney?

Mr. CARPENTER. I would plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Any more questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire, Mr. Chairman, that the two documents I have presented to the witness, marked "Carpenter Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively, be filed for the information of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. So ordered.

(The documents referred to were marked "Carpenter Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. You are excused as a witness.

You may call your next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. James Payne.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. PAYNE. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF JAMES PAYNE

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. PAYNE. James Payne.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Payne, it is the practice of the committee to advise each witness that he has the right to have counsel with him if he desires, and the right to confer with counsel at any time during his testimony if he desires. It is noted that you do not have counsel with you.

When and where were you born, Mr. Payne?

Mr. PAYNE. I was born in Oklahoma in 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. PAYNE. Evansville, Ind.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Evansville?

Mr. PAYNE. Approximately 18 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. PAYNE. Eighth grade.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you are now president of Local 2040 of a union. Is that correct?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does Local 2040 of the International Association of Machinists have the bargaining rights at the Servel Co. and at the Faultless Caster Co. at Evansville, Ind.?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1953 were you an official of a local union of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer for the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, you were a responsible officer of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Local 813, in 1952, were you not?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. As an official officer of that union you were required to sign the non-Communist affidavit under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act; were you not?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline for the same reason previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of an affidavit of non-Communist union officer purportedly signed by James Payne, and I ask you to examine it and state whether or not that is your signature. The document is marked for identification "Payne Exhibit No. 1."

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer.

I think the document speaks for itself. It is on file with the Justice Department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your signature on the document?

Mr. PAYNE. That I wouldn't be certain of.

Mr. TAVENNER. You would not be certain?

Mr. PAYNE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever signed a non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. PAYNE. I certainly have.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire the document marked "Payne Exhibit No. 1" be made a part of the records of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked and filed.

(The document referred to was marked "Payne Exhibit No. 1" and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The document states:

1. I am a responsible officer of the union named below.
2. I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party.
3. I do not believe in, and I am not a member of nor do I support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE) Local 813.

Signature: "James Payne".

Where did you reside in December of 1952?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer on the previous reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that because your true residence appears on the affidavit which I handed you?

Mr. PAYNE. My true residence for approximately 18 years, as I stated previously, has been Evansville, Ind.

Mr. TAVENNER. What address in Evansville?

Mr. PAYNE. It states in the affidavit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which is 518 Maxwell Avenue. Is that your address?

Mr. PAYNE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that the James Payne who signed this affidavit is the James Payne who lived at 518 Maxwell Avenue?

Mr. PAYNE. If that is my signature that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is no other James Payne living at 518 Maxwell Avenue, is there?

Mr. PAYNE. If there are I haven't seen them.

There are, however, Mr. Tavenner—there are several James Paynes in that city.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is one reason that I am questioning you with this particularity.

There is no other James Payne other than you at 518 Maxwell Avenue, is there?

Mr. PAYNE. No, sir. I have lived there for the last 7 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then we find at the bottom of this affidavit this statement:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of December 1952, a notary public or other person authorized by law to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in and for the county of Vanderburgh, State of Indiana.

My commission expires July 21, 1956.

SADELLE BERGER.

Was Sadelle Berger an employee in the office of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Local 813?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. You knew Sadelle Berger to be a member of the Communist Party, did you not?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. She has been so identified here today in testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. Is she still a notary?

Mr. TAVENNER. She was in 1952.

Were you in the hearing room yesterday?

Mr. PAYNE. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yesterday there was a witness by the name of Cortor who testified before this committee. He testified that he attended fraction meetings of the Communist Party within the electrical unit of the Communist Party. He said those fraction meetings were made up of representatives from probably six or eight electrical industries, including Wagner, Century, Superior, and others from which representatives—that is, members of the Communist Party groups in those industries—met on a fraction level to conduct the business of the Communist Party relating to the Communist fraction. He said there was an amalgamated group of the union which smaller, independent concerns had bargaining contracts with. One of those was the Johnston Tin Foil. He told the committee that you were the representative from the Communist group that met with this fraction, and that your employment at the time was with Johnston Tin Foil.

Is any part of that testimony insofar as it related to you untrue?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer on the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed by Johnston Tin Foil at any time?

Mr. PAYNE. About 19 or 20 years ago, I think it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. While employed by Johnston Tin Foil did you belong to a group or unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. PAYNE. That I decline to answer because of the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the nature of the business being conducted now by the plants in which your local union has bargaining rights?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. PAYNE. I still decline on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. It should be clear we do not accept that answer, because obviously he can tell us what type of activity the companies are engaged in, and it could not possibly incriminate him.

Mr. MOULDER. What company do you work for?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not work for any company, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are president of a local; are you not?

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that local is the National Association of Machinists, or in the National Association of Machinists, is it not?

Mr. PAYNE. I think I previously declined to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I think you should direct him to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. What union he is president of.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. PAYNE. I still decline, sir, on the basis my union affiliation is not a matter of investigation.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that the reason?

Mr. PAYNE. No. It is on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at one time, as late as 1954, secretary of District 8 of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, which is the district in which St. Louis is located?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. PAYNE. I still decline, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment and on the basis that my union affiliation is of no concern of this committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Except to the extent that there might be some effort to infiltrate that union by the Communist conspiracy. Then it is within the scope and purview of this committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Scherer, I no longer belong to that union.

Mr. SCHERER. But you may have been a member of the Communist Party at the time you were with that union.

Mr. PAYNE. Then I think the question should be directed along those lines rather than my union affiliation.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you belong to the union? We have to ask you first whether you belonged to that union.

Mr. PAYNE. I think counsel has established that.

Mr. SCHERER. You have refused to answer.

Mr. PAYNE. No; I didn't. He said I was president of a union local, and I said that was correct.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry. I apologize.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were a member?

Mr. PAYNE. That I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I find, Mr. Payne, that I have a photostatic copy of the current non-Communist affidavit of yours, which I desire to have marked "Payne Exhibit No. 2" for identification purposes.

Will you hand it to the witness so that he may examine it.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire Mr. Chairman, that the document be made a part of the records of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. "Payne Exhibit No. 2" will be so admitted.

(The document referred to was marked "Payne Exhibit No. 2" and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Payne, is that your non-Communist affidavit for the year, or for the period covered—December 5, 1955—which would be for the current year?

Mr. PAYNE. It appears to be a photostat. Other than that statement I couldn't swear to the veracity of the document itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. The address is still 518 Maxwell?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not moved, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And neither has the address on your non-Communist affidavit changed?

Mr. PAYNE. No, sir; it hasn't. In fact, I previously testified I have been living there 11 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. This shows that James Payne is a responsible officer of Local 2040, International Association of Machinists. There is that difference from the time of the other that I showed you because at that time you were with the UE.

The sworn statement at the bottom of it, or, in other words, the notary public is still Sadelle Berger.

Is Sadelle Berger a secretary of Local 2040 or office manager of Local 2040 at this time?

Mr. PAYNE. That I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. When you signed that affidavit did you tell the truth?

Mr. PAYNE. I think the affidavit speaks for itself, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer your question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean you won't tell this committee now whether you told the truth when you signed that affidavit?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Scherer, the Justice Department has copies of that affidavit.

I am quite sure if I had falsely sworn they would take the proper action in the proper court. Insofar as this hearing is concerned, I de-

cline to answer your question on the grounds of the protection of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. All right.

I think you are in contempt of this committee, sir, if you don't answer that question.

Mr. PAYNE. I didn't mean to be contemptuous, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't mean you had a contemptuous attitude. You have a very fine attitude. But I do think you are in contempt for refusing to answer that question. Here you have signed an affidavit and you refuse to tell this committee at this time whether you told the truth when you signed that affidavit.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first affidavit, Payne Exhibit No. 1, bears date the 19th day of December 1952. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you received advice or direction from the Communist Party regarding the signing of that affidavit or any other non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act which you may have signed prior to that date?

Mr. PAYNE. To that I will answer "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you signed the non-Communist affidavit of December 19, 1952?

Mr. PAYNE. That I decline to answer on the grounds previously given to the previous questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear discussed in any Communist Party group the question of officers of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America signing the non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. PAYNE. I am not sure I understand the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

I asked you a moment ago whether you were advised or directed what to do about signing non-Communist affidavits by the Communist Party, and you said No. Now I am asking you whether you heard that matter discussed in any Communist Party group.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the question is rather tricky, and I will decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; there is no trick about it.

Did you receive advice about the signing of this non-Communist affidavit by any official of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers?

Mr. PAYNE. I don't recollect receiving any advice on it. I think the filling out of one of those forms is very simple. It doesn't take any high officer in the union to advise you as to signing your name and reading the document that is there.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask this question:

Did you know what the policy of the Communist Party was with reference to signing non-Communist oaths under the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. PAYNE. That, Mr. Scherer, I have to decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask this question:

Where did you sign the affidavit?

Mr. PAYNE. Where?

Mr. MOULDER. Where? I mean at what place. What office?

Mr. PAYNE. I have signed about, I think, since 1948, 1949, Mr. Moulder—I certainly don't recall where. The chances are that it was in a notary's office.

Mr. MOULDER. Who is the notary?

Mr. PAYNE. It has never been the same one except I think Mr. Tavenner pointed out here, I think, there are two times Mrs. Berger had signed. But obviously it would have been in her presence, in accordance with the law governing notaries. But previous to that I certainly couldn't remember.

Mr. MOULDER. Where was her office located? Do you know?

Mr. PAYNE. I am not sure that I didn't sign it at her home, sir. I just don't recall.

Mr. SCHERER. That wasn't the question.

Where was her office?

Mr. PAYNE. That I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. She is the office manager, isn't she?

Mr. PAYNE. I think I declined that before, Mr. Tavenner, and I still decline on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. He just said he didn't know where her office was. How could he decline?

Mr. PAYNE. As I understood your question, sir, you asked about her office.

I don't know of her having an office.

Mr. SCHERER. You know what I meant.

Mr. PAYNE. I answered your question as you gave it.

Mr. SCHERER. What office does she work in?

Mr. PAYNE. That I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Payne, are you acquainted with Victor Pasche?

Mr. PAYNE. That I will decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't he now public relations director of your own Local 2040, the one of which you are the president?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Vic Pasche was identified by the witness Younglove as being a person known to him to have been a member of the Communist Party. Do you know whether he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer on the basis as previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would tell the committee whether or not you have been a member of the Communist Party at any time since you left United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America.

Mr. PAYNE. I decline to answer that on the basis as previously given, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time you held an official position in the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers?

Mr. PAYNE. I decline on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness will be excused.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have another witness?

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dorothy Sage.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you please hold up your right hand and be sworn, Mrs. Sage.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mrs. SAGE. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF HELEN SAGE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,  
GARNET W. TAYLOR**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. SAGE. Helen Sage

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the witness is accompanied by counsel, Mr. Taylor, who has previously been identified for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. And she was referred to me by the Bar Association of the City of St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Sage, what was your maiden name?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. Aukamp, A-u-k-a-m-p.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you say is your first name?

Mrs. SAGE. Helen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your full name?

Mrs. SAGE. My full name, according to the birth certificate that I have before me, is Helen Hulda Erna Aukamp.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been known also as Dorothy?

Mrs. SAGE. As Dottie, yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Commonly referred to by your friends as Dottie?

Mrs. SAGE. Yes, occasionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Dorothy?

Mrs. SAGE. Occasionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you also been referred to by the name of Dorothy in the press?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In a photostatic copy of the April 15, 1948, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat there appears on the first page a picture. Will you examine the document, please, the printed material underneath the photograph, and state whether or not you recall it as having been a photograph of you.

(Document handed to the witness and her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence, and ask that it be marked for identification only as "Dorothy Sage Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Dorothy Sage Exhibit No. 1," and filed for the information of the committee.)

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer withdrew from the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Underneath the photograph that I have pointed out to you is this notation:

A Communist, Mrs. Dorothy A. Sage, was transferred from her job in a restricted area at the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. for security reasons.

Were you an employee of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. shortly prior to April 15, 1948?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. MOULDER. I advise you then also that hereafter if you wish to decline to answer and use the reasons for doing so—the protection of the Constitution in that particular reason—you just merely state you decline to answer the question for the reasons heretofore given.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I believe yesterday we were giving a long answer, and you informed me that we could come down, or the person I was representing could use the short answer.

Mr. MOULDER. Either way you prefer to do it. I was trying to be helpful.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Tavenner, do you want the long answer or do you want the short answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. It isn't what I want. It is perfectly satisfactory whatever the chairman says.

Mr. MOULDER. It is up to you.

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present in the hearing room yesterday?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I was part of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear Mr. Cortor testify?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. Part of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear that part of his testimony relating to the meeting with fractions of the Communist Party within the electrical units of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I heard Mr. Cortor say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear Mr. Cortor testify with regard to activities in the youth group of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I will make it easier.

According to my recollection, Mr. Cortor testified that he knew you as a member of the Communist Party, and that you were engaged in the youth work of the Communist Party.

Was his statement in that respect true or was it false?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. I read into the record, during the testimony of Mr. Younglove, a document entitled "Proposed Plan for Missouri State Party Building Conference," bearing date of March 2 and 3, 1946.

That document showed and provides as follows:

Following are some of the proposed assignments: Electrical—Dottie.

Mr. Younglove testified that Dottie referred to you.

Did you accept the assignment to work in recruiting persons in the electrical units of the Communist Party, in the electrical units of industry in St. Louis?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain employed in the electrical industry, or over what period of time were you employed in the electrical industry?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were one of those who infiltrated the electrical industry at the instance of the Communist Party; were you not?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were discovered, and, as a result of it, you were not permitted to go into restricted areas of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. Isn't that true?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Tavenner, do you wish a shorter answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. I certainly do. I thought you preferred the other. I am very agreeable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Tavenner, yesterday I believe we were advised by the committee. Do we have that same advice of the committee now?

Mr. TAVENNER. The chairman rather suggested it to you awhile ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. I didn't understand the chairman that way, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did. Maybe I am mistaken.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are willing to abide and expedite it.

Mr. MOULDER. If the witness wishes to decline to answer and claim the privilege of the Constitution she may do so by merely stating that she declines to answer for the same reasons heretofore given. It will serve the same purpose as having given the full, complete answer which you have been reading.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article appearing next to the photograph has the heading:

"Woman Communist Is Found in War Plant Here. Fails To Show Up After She Is Shifted. Mrs. Sage Admits Being Red and Boosts Wallace."

Were you correctly reported?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article says this, that you were 1 of 3 employees transferred from the restricted area.

Who were the other two?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the other two persons placed in Emerson Electric by the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article states:

She is Mrs. Dorothy Aukamp Sage, who lives at 5673 Cabanne Ave., which is also the address of William Sentner, president of district 8, CIO United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America—

and so on.

Were you correctly reported as living at the address of William Sentner, president of the UE District 8?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was William Sentner responsible for your obtaining a position in Emerson Electric?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever engage in espionage against the United States, madam?

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean you won't tell us whether you engaged in espionage against the United States?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Scherer, could I address you just one minute?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would you give my client just—did I understand you to say "yes" or "no"?

Mr. SCHERER. I said "no."

Abide by the rules of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I'm sorry. I understand.

I just wanted to explain that one particular question. If you would give us some immunity on that, that we would only limit it to the one question without waiving anything else for my client.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think this committee should enter into any terms or agreements as to how far a witness is willing to testify and how far they are not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just on this one question was all I was asking, Mr. Tavenner. It makes kind of a bad—

Mr. MOULDER. Let us proceed.

If the witness had been guilty of espionage certainly we wouldn't desire to offer her any immunity from prosecution. On the other hand, if she is not guilty of espionage she can certainly give the

answer here that she is not and never has been, and be immune from prosecution if she is not guilty.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Moulder, I have studied a little law, and I know the advantage of that question sometimes.

If it is answered in either the negative or the affirmative it offers a waiver of your privilege against self-incrimination, whether it is answered in either the affirmative or negative.

Therefore, I know my client would like to answer the question if it is relative to the one question only and not giving away the waiver.

Mr. SCHERER. There are a lot of people that would like to answer only certain questions and pick out the questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is just the one question, Mr. Scherer.

I am speaking because my client has called it to my attention prior. But, due to being a lawyer, I know that I have to recommend she give the stated answer unless you will restrict it to that one question only and not let my client give away her waiver of the privilege of self-incrimination.

Mr. SCHERER. I think she has had very good advice.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank you, Congressman.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed after April 15, 1948?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I will ask you another question.

Did you ever report to the Communist Party any information you got while an employee of the Emerson Co.?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. That isn't quite as harsh as the term espionage.

See if you can answer that.

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of classified products was Emerson engaged in manufacturing prior to 1948?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Part of its enterprise was engaged in the manufacture of defense materials for the United States Government; was it not?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What restricted areas were there at the plant?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You are indicating by shaking your head that you do not know.

Were you restricted from being in certain areas?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you employed at this time?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. No; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I am a housewife.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time since 1952?

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time that I have not specifically inquired about?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. You are the wife of James H. Sage who testified here today?

Mrs. SAGE. I am.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you accompany him when he went to Europe?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Frazier, would you break that question down into parts? You have got more than one part in it, I believe.

Mr. FRAZIER. No. I just asked if she accompanied her husband when he went to Europe.

Mr. TAYLOR. Could you say——

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, I will ask her if she has ever been to Europe.

Mrs. SAGE. No; I have not.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know whether your husband went to Europe?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege of wife and husband, and refuse to testify against my husband.

Mr. SCHERER. He isn't being charged in a criminal case. You are not testifying against him.

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe if you read your rules of committee it is in your rules of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

And I wish to compliment and commend the distinguished attorney Mr. Taylor, whom I have known for many years, in his conduct in appearance and representation of this witness.

Thank you very much.

The committee will stand in recess until 9:30 a. m., tomorrow morning.

All witnesses subpoenaed for appearance here today are hereby notified to appear, their subpoenas continuing, in the morning at 9:30 a. m.

(Whereupon, at 5:05 p. m., Tuesday, June 5, the subcommittee was recessed, to be reconvened at 9:30 a. m., Wednesday, June 6, 1956, there being present at the time of the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)











BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3230

	a b	3231
<u>skip</u>	c d e f	3232
	g	3233
	h i j k	3234
	l	3235

Rocky Mtns pts 1-2  
Passports pls 1-4  
Papigoda pt 1  
St. Louis pls 1-4  
Save Our Sons



